

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

SEPTEMBER 1943

NOTES AND NEWS

THE Thirty-ninth General Meeting of the Classical Association was held at Cambridge from 13 to 16 April and was attended by an unusually large number of members and guests. The presidential address on 'The Relevance of Greek Poetry' was delivered by Dr. J. T. Sheppard, Provost of King's College, in the Regent House. In fact, a large part of the programme was devoted to subjects illustrating the relevance of the Classics to modern problems. It is hoped that these addresses and discussions will be published in full. At the opening session, held in the Combination Room of St. John's College, with the Master of St. John's presiding, the Master of Trinity welcomed the Association on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor. An address followed, on 'Thucydides and Modern Politics', by H. E. Dr. Demetrius Caclamanos. At later sessions Miss A. M. Dale spoke on 'Expressive Rhythm in the Lyrics of Greek Tragedy'; Professor W. B. Anderson on 'The *Aeneid* and Earlier Latin Poetry'; Dr. Ernest Barker on 'The Classical Heritage of Political Thought'; Dr. Norman Baynes on 'Byzantine Civilization'; Dr. Cyril Bailey on 'The Way of Life of a Stoic and an Epicurean'; and the Headmaster of Harrow on 'Hellenism and Christian Education'. A symposium was held on the place and value of the Classics in education for various walks of life. The Warden of Wadham presided, and the speakers included the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Richard Livingstone, Professor Allan Ferguson, Professor C. E. Inglis, and Dr. A. E. Clark-Kennedy. The testimony of representatives of a wide range of professional interests not only confirmed the faith of classical teachers in the general educational value of the study of the literature and civilization of the ancient world but also suggested ways and means of closer collaboration between

classical and modern studies in the education of the future.

The Annual Dinner was held at King's College, when the President proposed the toast of 'Hellas' and Dr. Caclamanos replied. The Rev. M. P. Charlesworth proposed the toast of 'The Humanities', to which the Vice-Provost of King's replied. A visit to Trinity College Lodge, at the kind invitation of the Master and Mrs. Trevelyan, to see the Benteleiana, was greatly enjoyed.

At the business meeting Sir Walter Moberly was elected President for 1944. It was also announced that the next meeting would be held at Harrow School; but owing to unforeseen circumstances the place of the next meeting has been changed. Further details will be circulated in due course.

From America comes the first fascicle of *Medievalia et Humanistica*, a new 'Journal for the Middle Ages and Renaissance', edited by Professor S. H. Thomson of the University of Colorado. F. E. Engreen writes on the Nilometer in the Serapeum at Alexandria and the transfer of flood-control from pagan to Christian hands; Ernst Levy on 'The Vulgarization of Roman Law in the Middle Ages', as illustrated by the successive versions of the *Sentences* of Paulus. B. L. Ullman records the discovery of Coluccio's marked and corrected copy of Dominici's *Lucula Noctis*, dedicated to him by the author, and two articles by Ernst Kantorowitz and Helene Wieruszowski deal with the *ars dictaminis*.

The editor of the *American Classical Weekly* has introduced the practice of collecting in one issue a group of five or six short articles on connected subjects. In some recent numbers, besides the usual longer articles, there have

been groups of notes on linguistic and geographical points in Caesar, on miscellaneous topics in ancient science, on Christian literature, and on ancient warfare. The amount of material at

his disposal and the range of interests displayed say much for the enthusiasm of classical teachers in the schools of the Atlantic States.

THE *OY MH* CONSTRUCTIONS AND ARISTOPHANES, *CLOUDS*, 295-7¹

As almost everybody knows, the double negative *oû mē* has two functions; one indicating *denial*, with the verb normally in the subjunctive, but sometimes in the future indicative; the other indicating *prohibition*, with the verb in the future indicative (obtained—hitherto—in a bare two out of thirty passages by emendation of an aorist subjunctive), this usage (which is confined to Attic and almost to Attic Drama) being restricted to the second person.² Orthodoxy, headed by Elmsley and Hermann, regards these as two constructions distinct from one another and of independent origin; the formula of denial is a statement, the formula of prohibition is really an exhortation put in the form of a question.³ Heresy

rejects this mark of interrogation¹ and would—more or less—turn the two locutions into one. Represented at the outset mainly by Dawes and Brunck,² this view was revived by Goodwin, who in *M.T.* §§ 294-301 and Appendix II (pp. 389-97) made a desperate attempt to explain the two formulae as different developments of what was essentially one and the same construction. So good a grammarian had naturally a reason for this perversity; what led him astray was in fact excess of scruple; and his authority has once again given the doctrine a limited and uneasy vogue.³

Fortunately we need not now consider Goodwin's theory. His account of the various types and sub-types of *oû mē* sentences is as complicated and baffling as the other is clear and straightforward. But in any case his doctrine has already been refuted; in particular by Jebb and Whitelaw, who are followed by Pearson.⁴

For all that, Goodwin does score one

¹ The substance of this note was read at a meeting of the Cambridge Philological Society on 20 Oct. 1938; summary in *Proceedings*, clxx. 7 f. In its present form the note has benefited both directly and indirectly from the criticisms of Mr. W. L. Lorimer.

² Not the second person *singular* (Goodwin, *M.T.*, § 297, and others)—an odd and unnatural restriction. For (i) there is (despite *M.T.*, § 299, a wholly untenable view; see n. 4, below) no essential difference between Soph. *O.T.* 638 (*oioere*) and, say, Ar. *Wasps*, 397. Moreover (ii) I cannot doubt that at Ar. *Frogs*, 607 (a dual) Tucker justifies his punctuation and construction (his view, as Mr. E. Harrison points out to me, was anticipated by Verrall in *C.R.* iii. 259). Indeed, the colon of the MSS. in *oûk ês kôrakas mē pōdouron* is itself in fact no bar, because—for whatever reason—scribes would sometimes insert a colon between *oû* and *mē* even when, as normally, they adjoin; e.g. R and others at *Clouds*, 296, V at 367 and 505; cf. Goodwin, *M.T.*, App. II, p. 391, n. 1.

³ Elmsley in *Quarterly Review*, vii. 454 (June, 1812) and on Eur. *Med.* '1120' (1151); accepted substantially by Hermann on *Med. l.c.*, *Opusc.* iii. 235 ff.; cf. Gildersleeve in *A.J.P.* iii. 202-5; R. Whitelaw (whose analysis and argument are very good, except as regards *Clouds*, 296—cf. p. 59, n. 1) in *C.R.* x. 239-44 and xvi. 277; Jebb on Soph. *O.C.* 177, cf. 849; Kühner-Gerth, i. 176 f., ii. 221 ff.; J. M. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax d. griech. Verbums d. klass. Zeit*, pp. 360 (1), 367 (2), 368

(1 and 2); J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen üb. Synt.* ii. 305. See further, n. 4, below.

⁴ So far as feasible; i.e. in my Types A and B (see p. 60, n. 1), but in C it naturally cannot be done, and that is just the trouble.

² Cf. Elmsley on Eur. *Med.* '1120' (1151) *sub fin.*

³ G. is followed substantially by F. E. Thompson, *Syntax of Attic Greek* (rewritten, 1907), §§ 297-9 (esp. 299); and with reservations by Chambers in *C.R.* x. 150-3 and xi. 109-11, Sonnenschein in *C.R.* xvi. 165 ff. and *Syntax* (6th ed. 1926), §§ 597 ff. and App. ii, p. 344. Brugmann-Thumb and Kieckers completely ignore *oû mē* prohibitive; whether from oversight or heresy does not even appear. Of current standard editions some are undecided or negligent; e.g. Hall and Geldart's Aristophanes has interrogative with compounds of *κατά* (!), *Ach.* 165 (but *not* at 166!), *Wasps*, 397, elsewhere not; Murray (Aesch. and Eur.) has interrogative eight times but refuses it four times (and, in my Type A, by preference).

⁴ See the excellent summing-up in Pearson's *Eur. Hel.*, Appendix on 437-9, pp. 199 ff., and references there.

point, and an important one. Against the view of the majority he registers a complaint which I, at least, have never seen satisfactorily countered.¹ This is at *Ar. Clouds*, 295-7, which I subjoin as printed in the (very conservative) Oxford text:

καὶ θέμυς ἐστίν, νυνὶ γ' ἤδη, καὶ μὴ θέμυς ἐστί,
χεσεῖω.

ΣΩ. οὐ μὴ σκώψῃς μηδὲ ποιήσεις ἄπερ οἱ τραγο-
δαίμονες οὖτοι,
ἀλλ' εὐφήμεῖ μέγα γάρ τι θεῶν κνεῖται
σμήνος αἰδαῖς.

σκώψῃς . . . ποιήσεις Elmsley: σκώψῃς . . .
ποιήσῃς codd.

The sense required is of course 'don't mock'; but by the orthodox view the subjunctive of the MSS. would give the sense 'you will certainly not mock'; accordingly Dindorf, Cobet, and editors and critics generally, follow Elmsley in altering the pair of aorist subjunctives to a pair of future indicatives. This is one of the only two² passages where emendation is necessary to secure the regular future indicative of prohibition; the other is *Eur. El.* 982, as to which see under Type A in note 1, page 60. Goodwin, who wrongly supposed that another such passage was *Clouds*, 367³ (see *M.T.* § 297 *fin.*), proposed to retain the three subjunctives then involved, in conformity with his own doctrine of the fundamental identity of the two constructions; and he protests here that Elmsley's σκώψῃς for σκώψῃς is too

arbitrary a change. To this it is replied—in effect—by Starkie that by modern reckoning the correct form is σκώψῃ and the change therefore amounts to no more than the dropping of a letter. But Elmsley's remedy still involves the alteration of two similar forms into two dissimilar forms. Its clumsiness is perhaps to be appreciated fully only by those who will follow the history of the critical process by which it was reached, and this can readily be done by reading *M.T.*, p. 396. It may fairly be called rough and unmethodical, a rewriting rather than a readjustment.

To Goodwin's transcriptional objection I would add a syntactical objection which so far as I am aware is new. The passage as thus rewritten causes an οὐ μὴ with future indicative to be followed by a copulative conjunction¹ which introduces an imperative. For such a combination there exists no justification whatever; it is as non-existent as it is unnatural. All extensions of οὐ μὴ with future indicative into co-ordinate clauses present one or more additional futures indicative. Our passage ought at this rate to be of the same form as e.g. line 505 of this play, οὐ μὴ λαλήσεις, ἀλλ' ἀκολουθήσεις ἐμοί; There are in Attic drama twelve (in my view, thirteen) such sentences (to say nothing of six in which the other—i.e. positive—future precedes);

¹ This is where Whitelaw fails (*C.R.* x. 240); for (*inter alia*) 'Won't you not-remain but—away with you!' is unnatural, whatever he says.

² My statement here of the case as regards MS. readings is (i) an accurate account of the practice of modern editors, e.g. Hall and Geldart, van Leeuwen, Coulon; (ii) a fair summary of the situation. Actually the question of readings is slightly more complicated, and may be appreciated by reference to Starkie's critical notes on *Clouds*, 296, 367, and references there; also to (e.g.) Pearson's text and critical notes on *Soph. Tr.* 978 and 979. But, of course, this and kindred issues are in any case essentially, as Jebb said on *Soph. O.C.* 849, questions of *usage*. And usage depends, not on MS. readings at this or that place, but on judicious deductions from a comparison of readings at all the relevant passages. That may sound obvious, but see my final paragraph.

³ Where G. states that all the MSS. have -ης. It would be truer, indeed I gather it would be strictly true, to say that none of them has that.

¹ Where an imperative does follow there is no copula e.g. *Eur. Andr.* 757 f. Similarly (for the sole apparent exception see the end of this note) after οὐ with future, e.g. *Ar. Lys.* 456-61. The difference is material; if anybody does not feel it merely from reading these passages, let him re-read them inserting *καί*. Furthermore, after a non-negated (and accordingly not interrogative) future there is only the MS. atrocity of *Pl. Prot.* 338a to circulate like the dinner-service of the Segestaeans until it looks normal instead of unique (in e.g. Wackernagel, i. 205; Kieckers, iv. 28). Why does the former say that such things are common? No one had ever produced another example, nor can W. The fact that there are three alternative ways of emending a passage does not prove that the traditional text is sound. [Where an imperative follows at a distance from the copula the case is naturally different; yet even here the sole example is *Soph. Ant.* 885-7, where the participial phrase keeps us expecting a second future (as in *Eur. Andr.* 1066-8) until the direct imperative is forcibly substituted by a slight anacoluthon.]

of these twelve (thirteen), six (in my view, seven) have ἀλλά here (the rest δέ, καί, or μηδέ), and of these six (seven) Aristophanes supplies five.¹ For that reason alone, we have not the right to introduce such an anomaly by emendation. And in fact the logic of language cries out against a sequence so gratuitously harsh. I note² in this connexion that the punctuation has to be faked. The emendation was introduced and is defended by the school who, rightly as I think, regard such sentences as interrogative; very well then, why do they not punctuate so here, as they do (when they remember to) everywhere else? The reason is that if you were to put the interrogation mark after the imperative εὐφύμει it would look ridiculous, while if you put it after οἶτροι, as Blaydes does, you make ἀλλά the first word of an imperative sentence, and it thus becomes transitional³ in a place where no transition is involved. The only resort then is to suffocate the

interrogative and trust that such a trifle will never be missed.

It is agreed—by all but a minute minority—that this passage has to be emended; and what I want to point out is (i) that it can be emended without introducing, as previously, two fresh anomalies, and further (ii) that the alteration required for this purpose is at once much simpler and much smaller.

For the moment, ignore metre and eliminate the οὐ; we are then left with the sense we require, expressed in better Greek than has ever yet been printed in this passage, expressed indeed in perfect Greek. Substitute, then, for οὐ the exclamation of remonstrance¹ δ. This is several times followed by μή, e.g. *Soph. O.T.* 1147; *Eur. Alc.* 526, *Hel.* 445; *Pl. Hipp. Ma.* 295a; in those places the verb is imperative, but the aorist subjunctive follows δ, *μηδαμῶς* in *Soph. Phil.* 1300 and *Eur. Or.* 1598. δ is Aristophanic: *Wasps*, 1379, *Frogs*, 759. For the corruption of a to ου see Schaefer's *Greg. Cor.*, p. 532.

This emendation has, I suggest, the further advantage of improving the sense in relation to *χεσεῖω*. It is hardly to be doubted that Strepsiades was beginning to suit his action to that word, for the delectation of an Old Comedy audience. οὐ μή σκώψει would be merely 'don't do that', but δ, *μή σκώψης* is more sudden and emphatic—'here! stop that!'

My object in this note is not merely to solve the problem of the Aristophanic passage but to complete the process begun by Elmsley of 'properly basing' οὐ μή. From the orthodox rule as stated in my opening sentence it must follow, unless serious ambiguity was to result, that in the formula of denial the future indicative would be limited to the first and third persons; for the second person there still remained what was for any person the commoner alternative, namely the subjunctive. This corollary is stated or implied by Jebb at *Ant.* 1042 f., *O.C.* 177, cf. 849. But the four passages concerned have never, I think, been

¹ As I know of no exhaustive list I append a tabulation.

(i) *Drama*. Type A, οὐ μή fut., 10: *A. Sept.* 250; *E. Hipp.* 213, *Andr.* 757, *Suppl.* 1066; *Ar. Ach.* 165 f. (2 exx.), *Clouds*, 367, *Wasps*, 397, *Frogs*, 607 (Tucker). [The first and last of the above have οὐ . . . μή.] And Elmsley rightly reckoned also *Ar. Thesm.* 1108. [To this type belongs also *E. El.* 982 (*πίσης* codd., corr. Elmsley) as that passage is normally edited; but now see under Type B.] Type B, οὐ μή fut. + fut. (pos. or neg.), 13: *S. Tr.* 978 ff. (*καί* . . . *καί*, 2 neg.); *E. Med.* 1151 ff. (*δέ* . . . *καί* . . . *δέ* . . . *καί*, 4 pos.), *Ba.* 343 f. (*δέ* . . . *μηδέ*, 1 pos., 1 neg.), *El.* 383-5 (*δέ*, pos.), *Hipp.* 606; *Ar. Frogs*, 298 (both *μηδέ*); *E. Ba.* 792 f.; *Ar. Clouds*, 505, *Frogs*, 202, 462, 524, *Ecll.* 1144-6 (all ἀλλά, as is also the next); and Denniston in an admirable note has convinced me that at *E. El.* 982-4 Weil's brilliant reconstruction (with Wilamowitz's amendment) is inescapable. Type C, οὐ fut. + *καί* μή (or *μηδέ*) fut., 6: *S. Ai.* 75, *Tr.* 1183 (both *μηδέ*); *O.T.* 637 f.; *E. Hipp.* 498 f., *Hel.* 437 ff.; *Ar. Ecll.* 1144 f. (all *καί* μή).

(ii) *Prose*. Type A: *Isaeus*, viii. 24 (but N.B. quoted as from a conversation). Type C: *Pl. Symp.* 175 a 10-11 (*καί* μή).

Total, 31 exx. in 29 passages. [I omit, of course *Ar. Clouds*, 295-7.]

² Cf. Goodwin, p. 396; but his deduction unfortunately is (p. 105, § 300) that this passage 'seems decisive against the interrogative theory'; and he admits that heresy even into a handbook for students, *Gk. Gram.*, § 1361.

³ Cf. J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*, pp. 13 (*fin.*) to 15.

¹ Cf. Jebb on *Soph. Phil.* 1300.

collected, still less discussed. At Ar. *Lys.* 704 no modern follows Bentley (Dawes, Meineke, and Dindorf!)¹ in introducing the indicative! At *Peace*, 1037, the MSS. give the indicative only, but van Leeuwen, Blaydes, Graves, and the Oxford editors rightly accept Elmsley's *παύση*. At Soph. *O.C.* 849 L and most MSS. give *-εις*, but from the *-ης* of A and R (= Ricc a) editors read *-ης*. Aeschines, iii. 177 as printed by editors (Blass, Teubner, ed. 2, 1908; Adams, Loeb, 1919; Martin and De Budé, Budé ed. 1928) has this: *τοὺς μὲν γὰρ πονηροὺς οὐ μὴ ποτε βελτίους ποιήσετε, τοὺς δὲ χρηστοὺς εἰς τὴν ἐσχάτην ἀθυμίαν ἐμβαλεῖτε*. Had anyone proposed *ποιήσητε*, there would be every reason to accept the change; in such a series—*καταλύσετε, εἰσονται, ἐπανορθωθήσεται, ποιήσητε, ἐμβαλεῖτε*—what more likely than that the one subjunctive should have been instinctively assimilated? Indeed to any superficial reader it would probably appear as if *ἐμβαλεῖτε* made *ποιήσετε* a

certainly, although actually the two clauses are not logically parallel: 'the bad people you *never will* (never can) make any better, while the good you will (definitely) reduce to the depth of despair.'¹ But the emendation cannot be made. *ποιήσητε* is already the reading of three MSS.; and, incidentally,² one of these (f), is, I gather, quite good. Are these unanimous editors temporarily under one of several hoary recensional fallacies, e.g. that a corruption (which is inevitably older than its correction) could never have been rectified before the invention of printing? Or were they ignorant of the syntactical facts? Or are they the sort of people who just must have an anomaly somewhere, to make language seem more real and jollier? Or were they too busy to bother?

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

University of Liverpool.

¹ An admirable sentiment which Weidner and his follower Richardson expunge.

² On the actual irrelevance of such considerations cf. p. 59, n. 2.

INTERLINEAR HIATUS IN TRAGIC TRIMETERS, II¹

BEFORE quitting my study of interlinear hiatus in the trimeters of Greek tragedy I put together the following notes, with an appendix on trochaic tetrameters.

That such hiatus may occur where much pause of utterance would be absurd is well shown by

τὸν γηγενὴ τε Κιλικίων οἰκῆτορα
ἀντρων ἰδὼν ᾤκτιρα, *P.V.* 351 f.;
ἴνα | αἱ Φορκίδες ναίουσι, *P.V.* 793 f.

Though *P.V.* uses this hiatus more freely than any other tragedy, yet Aeschylus in other plays uses it so often with no apparent purpose that we must not let the hiatus decide the difficult question of the punctuation of *Sup.* 768 ff., or mislead us into false emphasis on *ὑμᾶς* at *Sup.* 289. At *Sup.* 366, indeed, emphasis upon *ἐμῶν* is in place, but it is conveyed, quite apart from the hiatus, by the order of the words. Nor have I found any passage of

Aeschylus in which the hiatus is suspect; for only the delusion¹ that there is something wrong about an anapaest which is such only 'by position' could lead anyone to propose *δὺς ἑκατὸν* in *αἱ δ' ὑπέρκοποι τάχῃ | ἑκατὸν δὺς ἦσαν ἐπτά θ'*, *Pers.* 342 f.²

In Sophocles, on the other hand, and especially in *Trach.* and *Ant.*, interlinear hiatus where our texts put no stop ought to draw attention wherever it occurs. In *Trach.*, after classifying ten of the seventeen instances, I was left with a residue which will be further considered here.

Οἱ ὦν ἀφαρπάξιν φιλεῖ | ὀφθαλμὸς ἄνθος, 548 f., I can make no sense, and some remedy which removes the hiatus may be right. Another difficult passage is 1112 f.:

ὦ τλήμον Ἑλλάς, πένθος οἶον εἰσορῶ
ἔξουσιν, ἀνδρὸς τοῦδ' εἴ σφαλῆσεται.

¹ See, e.g., Wilamowitz on *Sup.* 282.

² [But between *Sup.* 946 and 947, and perhaps between *Eum.* 580 and 581, a comma may well be inserted.]

¹ This article, a supplement to that in *C.R.* lv (1941), 22–5, had not received the author's final revision at his death. The bracketed notes represent his pencilled *marginalia*.

There is evidence, I believe, though I cannot at present put my hand on it, that forms of *σχίσω* have been altered to forms of *ἔξω*¹ in our MSS.: but even with *σχίσουσιν* the sentence does not command confidence. In *ἀτὰρ τὰ πάνθ' ὁμοῦ* | *ἐκατὸν προσήγε συμμιγῇ βοσκήματα*, 761 f., it seems to me that the words *τὰ πάνθ' ὁμοῦ* are appositional and should be marked off by commas.

In *δοῖνεκ' αὐτὸν μόνον ἀνθρώπων δόλω* | *ἔκτεινεν* at 277 f. no comma is allowed by our practice, but the necessary stress on *δόλω*, which is not marked by unusual order of the words, may have been meant to be indicated by hiatus and pause.² So also with 934 f., where *ἄκουσα* is emphatic: *οὐνεκα* | *ἄκουσα πρὸς τοῦ θηρὸς ἔρξεν τάδε*. But I can offer no palliation of *ἐγὼ* | *ψικτιρα* in 463 f., or of *πολλὸν δ' ἄρσεν' ἐκτεμόνθ' ὁμοῦ* | *ἀγριον ἔλαιον* in 1138 f.³ After all, then, even in this play a small residue of inexplicable hiatus persists.

So much the less reason to suspect *χθονί* | *ἐν τῇδ'*, *O.T.* 97 f., in a play which makes larger use of interlinear hiatus; or even *πατρώων τὴν ἐμὴν ὅταν χθόνα* | *ἴδης*, *Aj.* 846 f., though the vowel before the hiatus is short and elidable, and *ἴδης* seems to have no advantage over *λεύσσης* or *βλέψης*.

In Euripides, *Her.* 43 f., with *νέας γὰρ παρθένους αἰδούμεθα* | *ὀχλῳ πελάζειν*, where Iolaus is speaking of himself and Alcmene, cannot be condemned; *αἰδούμεθα* is clear in the facsimile of L, but if a really good MS. turned up I should not be surprised to find it giving *αἰδούμεθον*: for many duals have been corrupted in our MSS.⁴

At *Her.* 286 f., *οὐ γὰρ Ἀργείων πόλει* | *ὑπήκοον τήνδ' ἄλλ' ἐλευθέραν ἔχω*, there is much to be said for Elmsley's *πόλιν*.

At *Hip.* 382 f., *ἡδονὴν προθέντες ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ* | *ἄλλην τιν'*, it is strange that

τὸ καλὸν should by implication be reckoned a *ἡδονή*, and *ἄλλην* may conceal some other word, perhaps *δειλήν*.¹

Suspicion already attaches to *Hec.* 52 ff., *γεραῖα δ' ἐκποδὼν χωρήσομαι* | *Ἐκάβη. περὶ γὰρ ἡδ' ὑπὸ σκηνῆς πόδα* | *Ἀγαμέμνονος, φάντασμα δευμαίνουσ'* ἐμὸν, where are two hiatus: but a fault seems to have been overlooked. Where else, in any language, does a son, even a son's ghost, so describe a parent? Of course, when a man is introducing himself to a stranger, or a character to the audience, he may name a parent or parents: *αἰδῶμαι δὲ παῖς* | *Ἀχιλλέως, Νεοπτόλεμος*; and in the first lines of *Hec.* *ἦ καὶ . . . Ἐκάβης παῖς γεγώς . . . Πριάμου τε πατρός*. But Orestes and Electra do not speak of their dead father as Agamemnon, or of their mother, alive or dead, as Clytaemnestra. Even Admetus at his worst does not call his father 'old Pheres'. That a child should thus call a parent by name is a thing of these lewd and latter days.²

Hec. 970 ff., *ὅτω γὰρ ὤφθην εὐτυχοῦσ'*, *αἰδῶς μ' ἔχει* | *ἐν τῷδε πότμῳ τυγχάνουσ'* | *ἔν' εἰμὶ νῦν* | *κοῦκ ἂν δυναίμην προσβλέπειν ὀρθαῖς κόραις*, have a grave and obvious fault, which can be removed by transposing two lines or, better, by Porson's alternative suggestion of *κάν* and *οὐκ*.

At *Sup.* 684 f., *ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἦ* | *ἐνθ' ἄρματ' ἡγωνίεθ'* | *οἱ τ' ἐπεμβάται*, the hiatus is between a main and a dependent clause; but the pause must have been slight. The MSS. have *ἦν*, and I have shown elsewhere (*C.R.* lvi, 1942, 6-9) that *ἦν*, though of the first person, may be right.

At *Rhes.* 974 f. the MSS. give *ῥᾶον δὲ πένθος τῆς θαλασσίῳ θεοῦ* | *οἴσω. θανεῖν γὰρ καὶ τὸν ἐκ κείνης χρεῶν*. The tragic poets often use *θεός* of a goddess where a neighbouring word shows the sex. The limits of this use are uncertain, but it looks as if euphony largely determined the choice of form. Of *θεός* and a feminine article with an intervening adjective of epicene termination I find no instance.³ Thus *τῆς*

¹ Such forms open trimeters, after hiatus, at *S. Phil.* 822; *E. Alc.* 960, *H.F.* 260, *Hel.* 1669, and in each place the meaning may be 'get' rather than 'have'.

² This applies also to *τὰ σὰ* | *ἔργ'*, *El.* 619 f.

³ [*Ant.* 58, 311, 98, 188, 164, 192, 659, 900.] (There is no explanation of what the writer meant to say of these lines.)

⁴ [*A. Ag.* 1559 (χειρά codd., χεῖρε Porson); *S. Ant.* 989 (βλέποντες L¹)]

¹ [But *ἄλλην τιν'* may mean 'other than ἄργία'.]

² [Perhaps *Ἐκάβη* is a gloss on *μητέρι*.]

³ [*Sept.* 720 (τὰν ὠλεστοικον θεῶν).]

θαλασσίου θεοῦ is suspect. If it is wrong, we have a choice of remedies,¹ for θαλασσίους is feminine in *I.T.* 236. The received conjecture is τῆς θαλασσίας θεοῦ but τῆς θαλασσίου θεᾶς is just as good; see *Soph. O.C.* 39 f., 458; *Eur. And.* 978, *Sup.* 260, *I.T.* 944, 1113.

In several passages of Euripides there is interlinear hiatus between θεᾶ and the goddess's name: θεᾶ | **Hpa Tro.* 976; θεᾶ | **Artemis I.T.* 35 f., 783 f. Perhaps the name was not connected as closely with the other noun as in 'Queen Anne' but was appositional and would bear commas.²

Short interlinear syllables without hiatus are so common that they must not be lengthened on bad evidence. As ὀνειδεσι | δάκομι is read at *Med.* 1344 f. and δάμασι | βούλη at *Phoen.* 552 f., so ἐβλεπε | Πρώτεύς and δάμασι | γυναικ' should be read at *Hel.* 60 f. and 1407 f. though at both places ν has been inserted by a late hand in *L.* Right or wrong, the evidence is against ν.

Even in *Trach.* or *Med.* not every interlinear hiatus can be palliated, though every instance should put us on the alert. Still less must we hope to see point and purpose wherever the interlinear syllable is short without hiatus, even where the breach between line and line is weakened by a neighbouring pause such as we denote by a stop. Yet even in such a case attention to the interlinear syllable may raise questions,

¹ Compare *And.* 130, where the MSS. are divided between τὰς πορτίας θεοῦ and τὰς πορτίου θεᾶς.

² So, a fortiori, with **Apollas θεοῦ* | **Hpas 'Aθῶνας θ'*, *Tro.* 23 f., where the variant reading θεᾶς would give too much a. So perhaps with other names also: *S. El.* 2; *E. Hip.* 582 (see *C.R.* lv, 1941, p. 25, note 1), *And.* 899, *Hec.* 892, *Sup.* 872, 1036, *Ion.* 4, *Tro.* 862, *El.* 764, *Phoen.* 758, *Or.* 853.

of which a single example may here suffice.¹ At *S. El.* 775 ff. our texts are at one:

ὅστις τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς γεγώς,
μαστῶν ἀποστὰς καὶ τροφῆς ἐμῆς, φυγὰς
ἀπέφευγότο.

If Sophocles had meant *φυγὰς* to go with the finite verb, and had had our system of stops, he would have marked his meaning by a comma. Failing that aid, or the poet's oral direction, the actor might well have connected *φυγὰς* with what precedes, and it is not clear to me that he would have been wrong. 'For-saking my breast and a runaway from my rearing.' For genitives dependent on *φυγὰς* see the dictionaries. Spoken by the mother, *μαστῶν* does not need τῶν ἐμῶν either expressed or implied in τῆς ἐμῆς and ἐμῆς.

Trochaic tetrameters² being largely used for stichomythia, most of them end with stops; and since they are catalectic they naturally have no enjambment. Hence, if the poets used interlinear hiatus indifferently, we should expect more instances between tetrameters than between trimeters; but in fact the instances are few. In twelve tragedies, of the ninety-one tetrameters that end with no stop, not one ends with hiatus. Of the twenty-five tetrameters of *A. Pers.* that end with no stop, two end with hiatus (163, 755); and the corresponding figures for *E. Bac.* are thirteen and one (622), for *I.A.* thirty and three (335, 366, 1375).

Trinity College, Cambridge. E. HARRISON.

¹ For a similar question, except that the interlinear syllable is long, see *O.T.* 846 f., where scholars are strangely unanimous in connecting *σαφῶς* with the following line. [Add *Med.* 1249.]

² [Needs check except for *A. Pers.*]

THERMOPYLAE¹

THE account of the operations at Thermopylae and Artemisium given by G. De Sanctis in his *Storia dei Greci* (2 vols., Florence, 1939) follows familiar lines. We read (ii. 29) that, whereas the Greek concentration at Artemisium was

¹ My hearty thanks are due to Dr. W. W. Tarn, by whose criticisms of a view which he must not be assumed to share this note has greatly benefited.

prompt, the Spartan command was slow in making provision for Thermopylae, with the result that only a small body of four thousand Peloponnesians, to be followed later by a larger force, was in position (together with some allies from Central Greece) when the Persian vanguard appeared before the pass; and on the next page we are told

that, by the inspiration it supplied, the self-sacrifice of Leonidas and his men went far to compensate for the strategical and tactical mistakes to which the disaster was due. Though he does not go into details, the distinguished author makes it plain that he would not seriously disagree with those who talk, for instance, of 'the unreality of the Spartan effort' (G. B. Grundy, *The Great Persian War*—London, 1901—273). On this version it may be worth while to offer a comment which is not irrelevant to the interpretation of the fundamental Greek strategy on this occasion.

Why stress the smallness of the force sent by Sparta to Thermopylae? Thermopylae did not fall for lack of men to hold it. The Persians did not turn the pass by following a route which the fewness of his troops had compelled Leonidas to leave unguarded; for the Phocians, whatever their precise position, were posted on the track which Hydarnes took. Nor is there any suggestion that they could not have blocked it had they tried: indeed, it is scarcely credible that they can have been assigned a task which, if events called for its performance, their numbers were completely inadequate to discharge. Thermopylae fell because some of the men defending it were the wrong kind of men. If, however, the authorities at Sparta were in error about nothing but the courage or patriotism of certain potential allies from Central Greece, their mistake is hardly to be described as strategical, and as tactical still less. If, on the other hand, Leonidas blundered by letting the Phocians take station on a flank where they might find themselves torn between the apparently conflicting interests of Phocis and of Hellas (see J. A. R. Munro in *C.A.H.* iv. 296 f.), the blame for what then was a tactical mistake rested with Leonidas himself, not with Sparta. In either case, without accepting all his premises, one may agree with Beloch's conclusion (*Gr. Gesch.* ii.² 2—Strassburg, 1916—101) that 'die spartanische Regierung trifft kein Tadel'.

There is one pertinent consideration, however, about which Beloch is silent. Herodotus (vii. 206. 1) says that it was because of the Karneia that the Spartans sent only a fraction of their army to Thermopylae with Leonidas, and that he was to be reinforced when the festival was over. Though there was division of opinion among the Greeks (Hdt. vii. 175, 1), if their religious concerns are not an adequate explanation of the Spartans' failure to give Leonidas a larger force at the start, half-heartedness is not the only other possibility—or the most plausible. Thermopylae and Artemisium were twin positions, each valueless in the circumstances of 480 B.C. without the other. If Thermopylae fell, the fleet could not stay north of the Saronic Gulf: if the fleet were defeated at Artemisium, the Persians could land troops east of the pass, take the defence from rear as well as front, and so not only open the way to the south but also in all probability destroy the whole Greek force engaged. In debating the expediency of a stand on the Thermopylae-Artemisium line, the Council at the Isthmus had to consider prospects both military and naval.

For the army, as such, the prospects were bright. Though there is a doubt over the Anopaea path (Hdt. vii. 175. 2), the essential facts about Thermopylae and its neighbourhood seem to have been known—the positions which had to be held and the numbers needed to hold them. Moreover, in the battles of the Ionic Revolt, and still more in Marathon, the Greeks had ample and encouraging evidence on the relative values of Greek hoplites and Asiatic infantry. But Thermopylae was not much better than a man-trap unless the Persian fleet could be prevented from landing troops behind it; and for the relative values of the two fleets the evidence was scantier and less convincing. First, though it has been denied by H. Delbrück, the authorities leave no room for doubt that, at the time when the Council had to take its decision, the Persian armada still greatly outnumbered the ships which the Greeks could muster against it—

probably by something like two to one. Secondly, at Artemisium it was by no means so difficult for the Persians to deploy their naval resources as it was for them to bring their full military strength to bear at Thermopylae. Thirdly, Lade was a reminder that it was not inconceivable that things might go wrong for the Greeks by sea. And, fourthly, a fraction of the Greek fleet possibly not much less than a third had been built by Athens during the last two or three years, with the result that the Athenian crews must have contained a ponderable proportion of men whose experience of naval warfare was limited.

These considerations may perhaps enable us to answer a question seldom asked, which, though primarily of naval bearing, is most relevant to an understanding of the policy on land. Were the Greeks in general at the beginning of the campaign so sure of the fleet as to rule out the possibility of its defeat? Whatever the personal confidence of Themistocles, the answer must be 'no'. Remembering that, if Thermopylae fell, every hoplite lost would be one less for a final stand farther south, rational men who were not certain that the fleet would hold its own can scarcely have avoided the obvious conclusion about the proper line of action on land, if Thermopylae was to be disputed at all. The necessary positions should be garrisoned at the outset with men enough to hold them until the prospects of the fleet had begun to declare themselves, but not with more. If the navy managed to cover the army's flank and the army were weakened by attrition, the army could be reinforced. If not, and the whole or part of the army failed to disengage itself in time to escape, the military loss would be as small as it could be made unless the pass was to be surrendered without a fight. Herodotus, so far as I can see, records nothing inconsistent with this account of the Greek strategy.

The truth, however, is obscured by some of his modern interpreters, who, having omitted to consider what view the Greeks at the Isthmus are likely to

have taken of the prospects at sea, are betrayed into the mistake of suggesting that the achievement of Salamis was the intention of Artemisium. An outright victory would certainly have enabled the Greeks to force Xerxes to retreat by cutting his communications with Asia; but an attempt to beat the Persians by a knock-out is not what probability would suggest as a reasonable strategy for the Greeks at the stage which had been reached when a stand at Thermopylae and Artemisium was under debate. And the hint that their purpose was different is confirmed by the course of events. On the first day of naval fighting the Greeks made what Herodotus calls an *ἀπόπειρα*—in the afternoon, when there was no time for a general action before dark; and, as soon as the Persian squadrons from the more distant beaches began to arrive, the Greeks bunched themselves up into what, though they did a certain amount of damage to the enemy, was essentially a defensive formation (Hdt. viii. 9 f.). On the second, if Herodotus is to be believed (viii. 14. 2), at the same late hour they fell upon one of the Persian contingents and retired when it had been destroyed. And on the final day it was the Persians who attacked—with considerable success (Hdt. viii. 16 ff.). The fortunes of the Greeks in this third engagement combine with their nibbling methods in its two predecessors to indicate that their commanders at Artemisium were not, and did not think themselves, justified in challenging the Persians to a decisive battle; and on this matter the commanders' opinions are of some value as a clue to the policy envisaged by the Council at the Isthmus. That this policy was to stop the invasion by destroying the Persian fleet is most improbable. It is far more likely that of the Greek army and navy it was the navy which seemed to the Council the less certain quantity, that the primary question about it at Artemisium was not whether it would win the command of the Aegean but whether it would avoid defeat, and that the task of Leonidas was to hold the pass until the

naval question had received at least some provisional answer. If the fleet failed, a large part of the army, if not the whole, would be lost. But on the other hand, as the Rector of Lincoln has said in words with which one may wholly agree, 'should the fleet succeed

in crippling the enemy's, the Peloponnesian army would be set free to advance and confirm the defence, and Greece from that point southwards might be saved from invasion' (C.A.H. iv. 281).

HUGH LAST.

Oxford.

ΑΚΗΡΥΚΤΟΣ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ (HERODOTUS, v. 81)

WITHOUT attempting to rewrite at large the history of the relations between Athens and Aegina after the Athenian victory over Chalcis and Thebes, I submit an examination of the phrase *ἀκήρυκτος πόλεμος* which Herodotus uses in describing them.

The word *ἀκήρυκτος* is not a common one, but in the tragedians it simply means 'unannounced', the context indicating who or what was not announced, and why (Soph. *Trach.* 45, Eur. *Her.* 89). The only other fifth-century passages stand close together in Thucydides, and their meaning also is quite clear. In i. 146, when relations between Athenians and their neighbours were becoming strained, *παρ' ἀλλήλους ἐφοίτων ἀκηρύκτως μὲν, ἀνυπόπτως δ' οὐ*: people still crossed the frontier without the protection of an official *κήρυξ*, though their motives were suspected. In ii. 1 the tension is greater; *οὔτε ἐπεμείγνυντο ἐτι ἀκηρυκτεῖ παρ' ἀλλήλους*: informal intercourse had now ceased, and if you wanted to cross the frontier you had to have a safe-conduct and escort.

From the early fourth century, however, there is a divergence of usage. Aeschines, 3. 230, has *ἀστεφάνωτοι καὶ ἀκήρυκτοι* in the tragedians' sense. Appian, *Mithr.* 104, revives Thucydides' use: *τὸ ἀκήρυκτον τῆς ὁδοῦ δεδιότες ἔφευγον ὁπίσω*: they felt themselves to be in enemy country, and would not advance farther without safe-conduct or formal introduction.

But Xenophon, *Anabasis*, iii. 3. 5, introduces another use: after an enemy envoy, coming under safe-conduct, had behaved treacherously, it was agreed *δόγμα ποιήσασθαι τὸν πόλεμον ἀκήρυκτον εἶναι ἔσθ' ἐν τῇ πολέμῳ εἶεν*: there was to be no attempt at intercourse with the enemy. Plutarch, *Pericles* 20,

may be using an early source for a fifth-century episode, when he writes *ἀκήρυκτος ἐχθρά* for an 'unappeasable' not an 'unannounced' feud; but more probably he is following fourth-century usage as in Aeschines, 2. 37 *ἐξ ὧν οὐκ εἰρήνη γένοιτ' ἂν ἐκ πολέμου, ἀλλ' ἐξ εἰρήνης πόλεμος ἀκήρυκτος*, 2. 80 *ἀσπόνδους καὶ ἀκηρύκτους τοὺς πολέμους ποιήσετε*: cf. Dem. 18. 262 *ἦν γὰρ ἀσπονδος καὶ ἀκήρυκτος ὑμῖν πρὸς τοὺς θεατὰς πόλεμος*. Later Dio Cassius (l. 7) writes *ἀκηρυκτεῖ πολεμεῖν* for war to a finish, without amenities.

There remains Plato, *Laws*, 626 a, *ἦν γὰρ καλοῦσιν οἱ πλείστοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰρήνην, τοῦτ' εἶναι μόνον ὄνομα, τῷ δ' ἔργῳ πάσαις πρὸς πάσας τὰς πόλεις αἰεὶ πόλεμον ἀκήρυκτον κατὰ φύσιν εἶναι*, which may mean *either* eternal war without formal beginning or end, *or* relentless war, as in other fourth-century passages.

This is the evidence on which to interpret *ἀκήρυκτος πόλεμος* in Herodotus; it must mean *either* 'relentless' as in the fourth-century writers, *or* 'unannounced', i.e. 'without formal declaration', as in the tragedians and Thucydides. 'Relentless' the hostilities between Athens and Aegina certainly were; but is that what Herodotus means? In his narrative the Thebans were trying to draw Aegina into their war with Athens. They began with an interpretation of an oracle of which Herodotus quotes a tag: *τῶν ἀγχιστα δέεσθαι*. Aegina did not wish to be openly involved, but 'sent the Aeacidae', who were as little use as the 'Ark of the Covenant' against the Philistines. The Thebans returned these fetishes (or relics) and asked for live troops. Aegina still refrained from open rupture with Athens; but there was *ἀκήρυκτος πόλεμος*. This can only mean that

'without formal declaration' there was raiding and reprisal, which is exactly what Herodotus goes on to describe. What it cannot in any case mean is what E. M. Walker said it meant (C.A.H. iv. 254 ff.): open official war by

Athens on Aegina (according to him some twenty years later) for conduct so gross that no formal declaration of war was ever delivered to Aegina.

J. L. MYRES.

Oxford.

CICERO, PRO SESTIO 72 AGAIN

(Cf. C.R. lvi, 1942, p. 68; p. 117)

FOLLOWING up Mr. G. M. Tucker's note on Cic. *Sest.* 72 I suggested that *Gracchum* should be emended to *Brocchum*: a conjecture which I have since come to regret. I venture to discuss the passage again in order to atone, if possible, for my rashness by vindicating the reading of the MSS.

Brocchum now seems to me ruled out by the reference to *Gracchum illum suum* in 82; even the intrusion of *Gracchus* for *Brocchus* in the codex R of Scribonius Largus (146) cannot tempt me to alter both passages. *Brocchum* is further made unlikely by the fact that, as Numerius here with *Gracchus*, so in the following sentence his colleague Atilius is matched with another great figure of the past. Moreover, I have convinced myself that to insist upon a specific jest over and above the biting irony immediately discernible in our passage is to misjudge its passionate rhetoric and to confuse its essential import with its incidental ornament.

The tribune Numerius is called *Gracchus*; whether by friend or foe we cannot and need not decide. To Cicero *Gracchus* means 'enemy of the state': *harusp. resp.* 41 'Ti. Gracchus convellit statum civitatis'; *Lael.* 37 '(Ti. Gracchum) rem publicam vexantem'; *Catil.* 1. 3 'Ti. Gracchum mediocriter labefactantem statum rei publicae'; *de orat.* 1. 38 '(Gracchi) rem publicam dissipaverunt'; *de fin.* 4. 66

'(C. Gracchus) rei publicae vulnera imponebat'. Thus, whatever it was that made people call the seditious tribune *Gracchus*, Cicero interprets it as grief. And the mockery? Again Cicero himself may explain: *leg. agr.* 2. 31 'a Ti. Gracchi aequitate ac pudore longissime remotus'; *harusp. resp.* 43 '(Ti. Gracchum) fortem et clarum virum'; *leg. agr.* 2. 10, 'duos clarissimos, ingeniosissimos . . . viros, Ti. et C. Gracchos'; *Catil.* 1. 4 'C. Gracchus, clarissimo patre, avo, maioribus'; *Rab.* 15 'cum vero his rebus omnibus (pietate, animo, consilio, opibus, auctoritate, eloquentia) C. Gracchus omnes vicerit'. Has Rome come to that pass that so despicable a creature can attack the State? *vulnera imponere*, like the great Gracchus, he cannot; he can merely *adrodere*. The insignificance of the man (*quisquiliæ seditiois Clodianæ*, 94), his obscure origin, his dastardly nibbling at the foundations of the State, his name of *Rufus*—and, trusting the scholiast, we may well add, his small stature and his red hair (Muenzer, *R.E.* xvii, 1326, considers *Rufus* his individual cognomen): they all combine in a flash to create the picture of the *nitedula*, which thus superimposes itself upon that of the pinchbeck Gracchus. No punning jest is wanted here to supplement what is fully satisfactory as a stinging utterance of anger and contempt.

University of Manchester. O. SKUTSCH.

TACITUS, HIST. i. 79

IN the course of a recent article¹ I referred to Tacitus' account of a battle between some Romans and Sarmatians because his description of the latter's

equipment gave general support to the picture of cataphracts drawn by other ancient authors; but Mr. F. W. Walbank has called my attention to one sentence of which most translations are unsatisfactory and of which the true

¹ C.R. lvi (1942), 113 ff.

significance has not been appreciated even by such commentators as seem to have realized that there is a difficulty. Tacitus writes 'sed tum umido die et soluto gelu neque conti neque gladii, quos praelongos utraque manu regunt, usui, lapsantibus equis et catafractarum pondere'. About the relative clause there has been difference of opinion. Some make it refer to *conti* as well as to *gladii*, an interpretation which, though permissible as far as the Latin is concerned, is open to fatal objections on other grounds. Spooner translates 'swords and poles of extraordinary length which they poise in either hand', a ridiculous picture which is not justified by the Latin, where the position of *praelongos* inside the relative clause must surely imply that the weapons, if *quos* includes both *gladii* and *conti*, were so long that both hands were needed to manage either of them. But, whatever may have been the case with the sword, we are expressly told by Heliodorus that the *contus* was so arranged that it could be and was controlled by one hand.¹ For this reason alone, apart from another which will presently appear, those who confine the relative clause to *gladii* are certainly right,² but even they, with two possible exceptions, convey the impression that they think that the whole sentence is a description of the situation in which the Sarmatian cataphracts found themselves when on horseback. To take an example, Ramsay translates 'what with the slipping of their horses and the weight of their coat of mail the riders could make no use of their spears and

their enormous two-handed swords'. Herein lie the main difficulties. In the first place a mounted cataphract could not spare both hands for his weapons (Heliodorus states, and he was surely right, that one hand was left free for the bridle);³ in the second place the weight of the coat of mail would not have handicapped a mounted cataphract on that more than on any other occasion. Spooner, who may have realized the second difficulty, though he does not say so, evades it by taking *catafractarum pondere* in close connexion with *lapsantibus equis* and explaining 'their horses slipped not only from the thaw but also (*et*) from the weight of the coats of mail'; but such an interpretation is not easy to get out of the Latin, and moreover is out of tune with the following sentence, which describes the advantages and disadvantages of the coat of mail from the point of view of the man ('ut adversus ictus impenetrabile ita impetu hostium provolutis inhabile ad resurgendum').

In any case such an expedient is needless; for a consideration of the context shows that the impression that Tacitus has only the mounted cataphract in view is due to a misunderstanding of a characteristically Tacitean figure of speech. The essential meaning seems to have been correctly divined by one translator and one commentator. C. H. Moore, in the Loeb edition, translates 'they could not use their pikes or the long swords which they wield with both hands; for their horses fell and they were weighted down by their coats of mail'; and E. Wolff's note on *catafractarum pondere* reads "'wegen", "infolge" der schweren Panzer, und nur von dem Falle zu verstehen, wenn die Pferde stürzten'. It is not clear what view Moore may have taken of the structure of the Latin; but Wolff certainly reached the right conclusion for the wrong reasons, for he continues 'da aber dies allgemein war, so konnten beide Gründe koordiniert werden'; therefore a fresh consideration of the passage will not be out of place.

¹ *Aethiopica*, ix. 15.

² For long swords as weapons of cataphracts there seems to be no other evidence, though all are agreed that their *conti* were long and heavy. This may account for Spooner's needless inversion; his interpretation, though wrong, shows that he did not make the mistake of supposing that *praelongos* could refer to *conti* and not to *gladii*. Tacitus (*Ann.* vi. 35) speaks of *conti gladiique* again in connexion with Sarmatians, but he does not there mention their length. Heliodorus allows his cataphracts swords as a secondary weapon, but since he uses the word *κοπίς*, he can hardly have had very long swords in view. However, there is no reason for supposing that the armament of all cataphracts was identical.

³ τὴν μὲν δεξιὰν κορυφῇ μείζονι λόγχῃς ὀπλίξει, τὴν λαίαν δὲ εἰς τὸν χαλινὸν ἀσχολεῖ.

In the sentence immediately preceding Tacitus states that while a charge of mounted cataphracts was irresistible, they made a very poor show at fighting on foot; this accords both with our other information and with common sense. On the occasion of this encounter the state of the ground made it impossible for the cataphracts to act as cavalry ('lubrico itinerum adempta equorum pernicitate velut vincti caedebantur'), and it is clear that the battle, such as it was, was mostly fought on foot ('Romanus miles . . . levi gladio inermem Sarmatam . . . comminus fodiebat').¹ In the sentence under discussion Tacitus tersely explains the whole situation. Owing to the state of the ground, which is the overriding consideration, the cataphracts could not use their heavy spears because their horses were slipping (i.e. they could not fight on horseback); and they could not use their long swords, which needed both hands to wield, because of the weight of their armour (i.e. they could not fight on foot). The sentence should be analysed as follows: 'umido die et soluto gelu neque conti usui, lapsantibus equis, neque gladii, quos . . . regunt, usui, catafractarum pondere'. The sword, as part of the cataphract's equipment, was essentially for use should the man be unhorsed; as long as he was in the saddle his weapon was the *contus*. A man fighting on foot could spare both hands for his sword, but it is obvious that the weight of his coat of mail would be more than usually obstructive if he was floundering about

in melting ice and snow (cf. 'altitudine et mollitia nivis hauriebantur'). Mr. Walbank, who professed himself satisfied by this explanation, pointed out two parallels for the figure of speech involved. At *Hist.* i. 62 we read 'ardor et vis militum ultro ducis munia implebat, ut si adesset imperator et strenuis vel ignavis spem metumve adderet'; at *Hist.* i. 6 'invalidum senem Titus Vinus et Cornelius Laco, alter deterrimus mortalium, alter ignavissimus, odio flagitiorum oneratum contemptu inertiae destruebant'. In both cases a double phrase in the first half of the sentence is picked up by a double phrase in the second half; in both cases each member of the second double phrase is limited in reference to the corresponding member of the first double phrase. Thus at *Hist.* i. 62 *spem* refers only to *strenuis*, *metum* only to *ignavis*; at *Hist.* i. 6 *odio flagitiorum* refers only to *Titus Vinus* (*deterrimus mortalium*), *contemptu inertiae* only to *Cornelius Laco* (*ignavissimus mortalium*). Similarly at *Hist.* i. 79, where the double phrases are *neque conti neque gladii* and *lapsantibus equis et catafractarum pondere*, *lapsantibus equis* refers only to *conti*, *catafractarum pondere* only to *gladii*. In one of the three passages the double phrases are expressed asyndetically; in one the linking particle is *vel* picked up by *ve*; in one it is *neque* picked up by *et*; but they all illustrate the same figure of speech, and if the First Book of the Histories contains three examples, it is highly likely that many more would be revealed by a wider search.

R. M. RATTENBURY.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

EURIPIDES, *Bacchae*, 461

ΠΕ. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν μοι λῆξον ὅστις εἰ γένος.
ΔΙ. οὐ κόμπος οὐδὲις ῥάβδιον δ' εἰπεῖν τόδε.

THE reader is sharply pulled up by the puzzling *κόμπος*. My friend Mr. C. H. Roberts formerly suggested to me that *κάματος* should be read. Later I thought that *μόχθος* might be the word: this I conjectured from line 1279 of the play *σκέψαι νῦν ὀρθῶς βραχὺς ὁ μόχθος εἰσιδεῖν*. Also Soph. *O.C.* 1162 *βραχὺν . . . μῦθον οὐκ ὄγκου πλέων* pointed

for a moment to *ὄγκος*, but quite unpersuasively. Recently, however, while reading Mr. D. L. Page's *Greek Literary Papyri* I became convinced that *οὐκ ὄγκος οὐδὲις* should appear here. This from a passage in the *Pirithous* ascribed to Euripides: *οὐδὲις ὄγκος πάντ' ἐκκαλύφασθαι λόγον* (Page, vol. i, p. 124, l. 20: von Arnim, *Suppl. Eur.*, p. 41, l. 5). It will be seen that here Aeacus cross-questions the stranger Heracles as to his *πατρίς* and *γένος* just as Pentheus examines the stranger Dionysus. *Oxford.*

E. L. B. MEURIG-DAVIES.

ΦΟΒΟΣ ΕΚ ΦΟΒΟΥ

IN the strange poem first published in *Fayum Towns and their Papyri*, 1900, no. 2, p. 82, and printed by D. L. Page as no. 94, p. 416 of his *Greek Literary Papyri*, i, 1942, the third line was restored by the discoverers as

ἐφοβέτο φόβος γόνυ δὲ [κ]φόβο[ν]

The restoration was improved by J. D. Beazley to [μ]φόβο[ν], but the truth is surely

ἐφοβέτο φόβος γόνυ δὲ [κ] φόβο[ν].

For the expression cf. e.g. *Il.* xix. 290, *Soph. Trach.* 27 ff.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

ΕΥΝΑΖΩ¹

Twice in Sophocles *εὐνάω* is used of putting to the sleep of death; and L.S.⁹ give this meaning to the verb in *Rhes.* 762, *ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἤνασ' Ἑκτόρεια χεῖρ*. True, their beds were deathbeds for Rhesus and most of his men; the speaker, the Charioteer, suspects that their murderers were Trojans; and in 835 he taxes Hector with the treachery. But in 762 the reference is merely to 518 ff., where Hector says that he will show them their sleeping-quarters: 'sent us to bed.'

By the way, 762 has more than one strange feature. 'Ἑκτόρεια' is defended by *Διομήδεα* in *Ar. Eccl.* 1029, and by *Πολυδεύκεια* in *Callim.* fr. 496, but the latter is dubious (see Schneider).

One manuscript gives 'Ἑκτόρεια χεῖρ εὔνασε, on which see Paley's note. If it is right, I should suppose not synzesis but a fourth anapaest, though the play has no other trimeter with an anapaest in any foot but the first, and such later anapaests are almost, if not quite, confined to proper names; the instances which involve adjectives derived from such names are few and dubious. Moreover, *χεῖρ* before the final cretic seems to me to be a breach, not indeed of Porson's Law as Porson enounced it, but of the principle which underlies it: that strong caesura of a fifth spōndee is eschewed.

But a more serious fault, with either reading, is in *χεῖρ*. Where else is *χεῖρ* with a genitive or adjective used, as are *δέμας* and *βία* and *κάρα*, in periphrasis? What mention of Hector's hand should mean appears from *P.V.* 619, *βούλευμα μὲν τὸ Διόν, Ἑφάιστον δὲ χεῖρ*, and from *Aj.* 490: here it has the ludicrous suggestion that Hector personally laid the Thracians in their beds.

If, however, 'Hector's hand' means here just 'Hector', we need not be troubled by *λέξας* in the following line: such a periphrasis is regularly treated as having the gender of the name which it involves.

¹ This note had not received the author's final revision.

On present evidence I am inclined to conjecture *Ἑκτορος βία.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

EUNAPIUS, frag. xiv. 7

THE importance of Eunapius, frag. xiv. 7, in the discussion on the lost historical works of the Emperor Julian requires no emphasis; but the value of the fragment has not been increased by the corruption in its first sentence. Eunapius there says that Julian wrote *περὶ τῆς σπαρταίας τῆς κατὰ †Ναρδωνῶν*, an altogether unknown name. Müller's suggestion, *F.H.G.* iv. 20, *κατὰ τῶν Ναρσικῶν*, has been dismissed because Ammianus has nothing to say of an encounter between Julian and the Narisci, and because that people does not appear in this period at all. W. Koch, *Kaiser Julian der Abtrünnige*, p. 336, rightly withdraws his and Bekker's proposal, *κατὰ τῶν Ἀλεμανῶν*, on the ground that it could not have been corrupted to the present text. These two conjectures are recorded by Jacoby, *F.Gr.H.* ii B. 950 f., in his critical note, but in his text he prints *κατὰ Ναρδωνῶν* without comment. I would suggest *κατὰ Χνοδομαρίου*, the name of the German king whom Julian defeated at the battle of Strasbourg. The historians frequently mention him, so that his name would be familiar to Eunapius' readers, but in later times it would be very likely to puzzle a scribe, who, once a start had been made with the corruption, would inevitably make of it a plural name to denote a tribe, even an unknown one, as Julian's opponents. The process has begun in the *Építome de Caesaribus*, xlii. 14, where the king appears as *Nodomarius* in the MSS. Moreover, this reading admirably suits the context, for Eunapius' expression implies that the campaign in question was a well-known one: Julian's writings at this time (winter A.D. 357/8) had a propaganda purpose—see Seeck, *Untergang*, iv. 264 f., 479 f.—and there would be little point in his writing a pamphlet on a campaign against a minor and obscure tribe, such as the Nardini (if they ever existed) or the Narisci. Eunapius describes the campaign as *πολύτροπος*, and the adjective well suits Julian's position when left in the lurch by Barbatio and forced, almost against his will, to rescue himself from a desperate situation by one of the most famous victories in Imperial history. Finally, with this suggestion we have not to assume the existence of an otherwise unknown historical work of Julian; Eunapius is referring to the *βιβλίδιον* which, as he tells us in another fragment, Julian devoted to an enthusiastic description of the battle of Strasbourg, frag. ix *ἱκανῶς ἅμα καὶ συνενθουσιῶν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ καλοῖς βιβλίδιον ὅλον τῆδε ἀναθεῖς τῇ μάχῃ, κτλ.*

E. A. THOMPSON.

University College, Swansea.

REVIEWS

THE STYLE OF AESCHYLUS

William Bedell STANFORD: *Aeschylus in his Style*. A Study in Language and Personality. Pp. iv+147. Dublin: University Press (Oxford: Blackwell), 1942. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

THIS is a detailed analysis of the elements composing the style of Aeschylus, combined with an attempt to explain them, where possible, as illustrative of the poet's temperament. Such an attempt, if not carried too far, may be interesting and illuminating, and in the case of Aeschylus the task is not more difficult than in that of other authors in whom certain personal characteristics appear to have been strongly marked—Carlyle, Byron, and many others. Professor Stanford's attitude in the matter is judicious and his conclusions in this regard are not likely to be disputed; they are in the main based on Aristophanes, whom he rightly regards as the foundation of all later criticism of Aeschylus. His analysis of stylistic elements is also in the main very sound, though in some points there is room for difference of opinion, and, where it threatens to become 'dry-as-dust', it is nearly always relieved by touches of human interest or by comparison with modern writers. The book should certainly be useful to students of Aeschylus and to systematic students of language.

Chapter i contains a discerning and sometimes illuminating, though brief, account of Ancient Criticisms of the poet, which, as the author remarks on p. 8, tend to vacillate between justification of the poet and his work for their μεγαλοπρέπεια and condemnation for αὐθάδεια. The suggestion (p. 10) that the excessive bombast of the fragment of the *Oreithyia* may have been deliberately intended as appropriate to Boreas, the speaker, is interesting, and it might have been possible to apply the idea to other speeches 'in character'—to Herald's Greek, Nurse's Greek, and so on, as well, of course, as to parts of the *Septem*, where the style is probably as

much a means of characterization as the result of original sin in the poet. Professor Stanford gives a good explanation (p. 11) of the difficult passage about Aeschylus in *de Subl.*, c. 15, and incidentally of *Agam.* 1026 ff.; but I doubt his translation of Aristophanes' ἀθύρματον and κρημνοποιόν on p. 4, and the (borrowed) interpretation (p. 6, footnote) of ἀνθηρά, εὐκρατος, and αὐστηρά, applied to style, as being derived from wine. There is no instance, I think, of ἀνθηρός or ἄνθος being applied to wine (ἀνθοσμίας means 'smelling of flowers'); εὐκρατος is very seldom so applied (if at all before Aristotle), and commonly refers to temperature.

Chapter ii enumerates the poet's borrowings from literary and colloquial sources. It opens with a wise caution against seeing borrowings where there may be none, and it is well said (p. 24) of some striking metaphors that 'it must not be thought that these were necessarily conscious adaptations. At times Aeschylus may have had no notion that phrases of his like these were anything but original.' After a careful comparison of Homeric and Aeschylean word-forms, vocabulary, and phrases, Professor Stanford passes to Hesiod. I do not think it is necessary to suppose that 'Aeschylus' views on ὕβρις, δίκη, etc., probably were derived through Solon from *Works*, 214 ff.'. Aeschylus had a mind of his own, and the facts which suggested such ideas were such as to stare anyone in the face. The description of Clytaemnestra as a fawning dog (p. 28) is very aptly compared with that of Cerberus in *Theog.* 769 ff., but the picture was probably common property at any time in Greece (cf. *Od.* xi. 427 ff., xvii. 302). After noting some parallels between Aeschylus and Solon, Theognis, and the lyric poets, Professor Stanford lays some stress on the change made by Aeschylus from Phrynichus' τὰδ' ἐστὶ Περώων τῶν παλαι βεβηκότων to his own τὰδε μὲν Περώων τῶν οἰχομένων, as though the

latter carried a hint of death which the former did not. But what of Euripides, *Alc.* 392, βέβηκεν, οὐκέτ' ἔστιν Ἀδμήτου γυνή? Is not the metre all the explanation that is required? Verrall's theory of the language of the *Persae* really requires more discussion, and still more do the real or supposed borrowings of the poet from the language of mystery-cults; it is just as likely that the Orphic *Argonautica* borrowed from Aeschylus as that Aeschylus borrowed from mystery-cults expressions found in the Orphic poem and conjectured to have been in use before Aeschylus; nor is ἀπαλλαγὴ πόνων, especially in the mouth of the Watchman, necessarily a mystic idea. How could the idea of relief be more naturally expressed by the most unmystical person? The valuable section on medical terms might have included a reference to *Agam.* 179, 976-7 (the περικάρδιον αἶμα as the seat of certain emotions or forebodings), but there is an interesting note on these passages on p. 130. I doubt whether ἐντέμνων (p. 57) would naturally suggest surgery; it is used mainly of engraving or of the cutting up of sacrificial victims. Some of the terms referred to in a note on p. 58 as technical had probably ceased to be consciously such.

Chapter iii on 'The Choice of Words' contains little that is new, but covers the familiar ground fairly fully. The writer is perhaps too ready to see a deliberate technique, using 'typical wooden stilts for elevating style', in what may have been the natural impulsive expressions of a fervid and imaginative temperament, which did

not stop to analyse or even criticize the words that suggested themselves; and here and there he may be a little fanciful. (I doubt whether the αἰθων λῆμα of Polyphontes in *Septem* 448 is really intended to contrast with the 'smoky' Capaneus whom he is to oppose. There is no hint of καπνός in the text.) But the chapter is a convenient summary.

There is much more freshness in ch. iv on 'Imagery and Imagination'; I have no space for quotation, but I may call attention to some particularly good expositions of passages in the *Septem* and the *Choephoroe*. (Incidentally the chapter may send its readers back to Walter Headlam's article in *C.R.* xvi, to which ch. vi also owes a good deal. The debt is fully acknowledged.)

After ch. v, a judicious discussion of 'Characterization by Stylistic Means', and ch. vi on 'Sources of Obscurity', in which the likening (p. 128) of the obscurity of Aeschylus to that of the poets of the present day is not very convincing and perhaps does the latter too much honour, there is a final chapter of 'Conclusions'. These mainly concern the stages of the poet's development and the reasons for his unpopularity at Athens, which, Professor Stanford concludes, was 'a matter of temperament'; I am not sure that this is very helpful, but it is briefly illustrated.

There are a few misprints in Greek words: ἐπαθήσετε (p. 68), προσμεμηχανωμένην (p. 78), ἄρκος (p. 123)—and John Addington Symonds's initials (p. 132) should not have been given as A. J.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

MURRAY'S TRANSLATION OF MENANDER

The Rape of the Locks. The *Perikeiromenē* of Menander. Translated into English verse, and with the gaps in the papyrus fragments conjecturally filled in by Gilbert MURRAY. Pp. 116. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1942. Cloth, 5s. net.

MANY years ago Professor Murray showed that he was adept at translating Greek comedy by his version of *The Frogs*; later by a fine version of one of

the best known *fragmenta* he showed what he might do for Menander. He now gives us *Perikeiromenē*; and he has taken the bold, and surely the right, course of filling in the gaps—for, though more than half the play is missing, its general structure is known. He disarms criticism by saying, 'this is not a work of exact scholarship'; and he has deliberately refrained from indicating anywhere which parts are genuine

Men
tion
of
tram
only
perm
l. 2
sixt
acce
thre
his
able
tain
wou
Men

In
I mi
so a
as in
for i
ness
but
like
scen
and
it, e
be a
Eve
note
indie
tran
of r
seem
tone
out
for
diffi
tion
brin
the
conv
the
conv
kind
gene
level

Oh, y
That

for

το
ἀν

1 M
emen
459

Menander and which conjectural restoration (a somewhat pedantic avoidance of pedantry). For all that, he has translated the original closely, and in only one place has he transgressed the permitted limits of restoration—after l. 216, where there is a gap of some sixty lines (or so it has been generally accepted) and Murray inserts nearly three times as many. He has achieved his principal aim, a single, understandable play, so evenly wrought that certainly without the Greek in mind it would be difficult to guess what is Menander and what Murray.

In another sense, too evenly wrought. I miss Menander's variety of tone—not so apparent, it is true, in *Perikeiromene* as in *Epitrepontes*, but not to be missed, for it is one of the secrets of his greatness. Menander is full of sentiment; but Murray, though he gets something like it in one or two places, in restored scenes, as in that between Pataikos and Glykera, pp. 74–8, in general misses it, especially in Polemon, who should be altogether a sympathetic character. Even in the recognition scene, where he notes of course the change of tone indicated by the 'tragic' *senarii* and translates them into his own convention of rhymed couplets, he fails (or so it seems to my ear) to get the elevated tone which alone makes a long-drawn-out passage possible. This is important; for Menander is here attempting a difficult thing—not merely the repetition of a well-worn theme, but the bringing to life, by making it part of the play, of what is all very well as conventional preamble, the exposure of the children, but is only with difficulty convincing as an act of the wise and kindly Pataikos that we know. In general Murray keeps too much to the level of the Sosias scenes:

Oh, you're in love I know. But don't you see
That makes this conduct all the more demented

for

ἐρῶς,¹
τοῦτ' οἷδ' ἀκριβῶς, ὥσθ' ὁ μὲν νυνὶ ποιεῖς
ἀπόπληκτόν ἐστιν (244–6);

¹ Murray's reading for the MS. ἐρεῖς, a probable emendation.

If henceforth I don't always do my best
for

εἰ μὴ διατελῶ πάντα φιλοτιμούμενος (265);

and

Good Lord, I'm in the devil of a mess

for

κάκιςτ' ἔφθαρμ' ὁ δυστυχὴς ἐγώ (348).

And even in the humorous scenes, his use of slang, or something approaching slang, is foreign to Menander: οἱ συνήθεις, *his mates*; ἐπαυνῶ διαφόρως κεκτημένην, *My stars, our mistress is a brick*; φιλάττη, *the duck!* (l. 115); λελάληκας, *it's simply rot you talk*. Similarly in a restored scene in Act III, after l. 300: the subject-matter of the talk between Myrrhine and Moschion is probable enough, but the comic tone seems to me wrong; just as it is in the rendering and restoration of Moschion's sentimental soliloquy, ll. 282 ff. One or two other restorations also are not happy, noticeably Glykera (in the first scene) believing that Moschion knew she was his sister. Menander is not sentimental in that way.

Menander is so simple and direct in his story and in his manner of telling it that he needs little introduction and no explanation. Yet Murray explains and apologizes for the conventions of plot and of stage devices (prologue, asides, soliloquies, etc.)—which is surely unnecessary for the countrymen of Shakespeare and for men who can appreciate Molière and Sheridan. He says, 'to ancient critics Menander's art seemed the very summit of naturalness and closeness to life'; and adds, 'they could hardly have thought otherwise'. Why should they? It is a correct judgement, not for the ancients only but for us. It is we who would often spoil his naturalness, especially by our emphasis on some legal, and so topical and remote, aspect of his stories. Murray is not free from this: to translate

ἐλευθέραν

ἔχειν γυναῖκα πρὸς βίαν τοῦ κυρίου (185–6)

Detaining a free woman here against
Her guardian's orders

instead of 'a lady' and 'her lord', and
θεράπαινα (318) 'slave girl' instead of

'servant', may be no great matter;¹ to introduce 'a stateless woman' in l. 303, where Menander has only the simple irony of

κατ' ἐμὲ γὰρ πάνυ
γέγον' οὗτος,

is bad. Worst of all, because so undramatic in its place as well as so 'unlike life', is to insert in a restored scene in Act V

Of course he had
A perfect legal right. No one is bound
To rear a baby if he doesn't want to—

after we have had the human story of the exposure. All this is because we do

¹ Incidentally, Murray apparently restores here οἷα ἄν, not οἷδ' ἄν, as most edd.; surely wrongly. Glykera is not so insincere as to call herself a θεράπαινα.

not allow ourselves to read the most natural of writers naturally; in Murray's case because he can see in the conventional preambles of Menander's plots the Year Daemon or Vegetation Spirit, and explains thereby 'the monotonous recurrence' of stories and the apparently 'peculiar lack of inventive power in these successive generations of highly original dramatists'; and can wonder whether Menander took 'his Year-Babies and Revels and Recognitions and Reversals' unquestioningly, or 'rebelliously murmured to himself: "I could make a better play without all this ritual lumber, but I suppose the priest of Dionysus would object."'
Ἄλλ' οὐδὲν τοῦτο πρὸς Μένανδρον.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

THE ATTHIDOGRAPHERS

Lionel PEARSON: *The Local Historians of Attica* (Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association, vol. XI). Pp. xii+164. Philadelphia: American Philological Association (Oxford: Blackwell), 1942. Cloth, \$2.25.

THIS volume displays almost all the qualities which make a good book—command of the bibliography, lucidity, common sense, brevity—except the decisive one: the courage to be wrong (which, sometimes, turns out to be the courage to be right). The author avoids committing himself to thorough-going research; he is superficial. I beg leave to write with a *παρηγορία* which is more of the cynic than of the epicurean type, because the author is one of the most promising workers in the field of historiography. I honestly feel that he could do ten times better.

Five points usually interest the student of the *Atthis* tradition: the peculiarities of the individual historians; the characteristics of the literary type of the *Atthis*; the relations between Atthidographers and other historians; the relations, if any, between Atthidographers and the priestly traditions of Athens; the influence of the *Atthides* on Aristotle's *Ἀθ. Πολ.* Mr. Pearson

adds very little to our knowledge of the individuality of each Atthidographer. The articles on them in Pauly-Wissowa, though of different value, are invariably better. Comparison between the two treatments of Ister is instructive. Philochorus invited special care, the article in P.-W. being clearly inadequate; but here also the opportunity either of detailed study or of a bold comprehensive sketch was rejected in favour of a dull résumé. A general survey of the *Atthis* tradition is, indeed, produced in the last chapter and contains some valuable remarks, but it does not discuss the literary form of the *Atthis*. H. Bloch's observations on this subject in *Harvard Studies in honor of M. S. Ferguson*, 1941, show what one could do; and R. Laqueur, in his article *Lokalchronik* in P.-W., raised the pertinent question of the relation between the form of the *Atthis* and the form of other local chronicles. Besides, one must face the general problem of the relation between chronicle and history in Greece. This may seem too philosophical a consideration, but it is essential to the understanding of the whole development of European historiography. One can study the subtle, incomplete, changing barriers which

have always separated chronicles from histories in Charon of Lampsacus or in that wise man Sempronius Asellio, in Grotius or in Niebuhr (who wrote an essay *Ueber den Unterschied zwischen Annalen und Historie*, 1827). Without bearing this difficult question in mind, one can hardly do justice to the Atthidographers and to their relations to political historians. The least persuasive chapters of P.'s book are those devoted to the third point. P. consistently confuses two different questions: what a certain historian, for instance Thucydides, learned from a certain Atthidographer (or taught to a certain Atthidographer), and what are the similarities between Atthidographers and political historians. It is obvious that resemblances seldom prove any direct relation, but depend on common patterns of thought, the study of which would require a different technique. Also the discussion of the relation of the *Atthides* to the religious traditions of Athens (made difficult by our scanty knowledge of Athenian sacral lore) marks no relevant progress: the recent contribution to the subject by K. v. Fritz in *Trans. Amer. Phil. Ass.* lxxi (1940), 91, is more important. And finally at p. 104 n. (cf. p. 84) P. bluntly dismisses as incapable of solution the problem of the influence of the Atthidographers on Aristotle. He does not seem to be aware that this problem presupposes a study of the style and of the documentary sources of the *Atthides* which is to be found nowhere in his book.

Lack of research is equally evident in details. The reader without specialized information can hardly realize the number of difficulties which loom behind the remarks of the writer. I take as an instance p. 12, on the list of the Athenian kings, because P. has already discussed the point in his *Early Ionian Historians* and therefore must have made up his mind. The duplication of the names of Cecrops and Pandion in the list of Apollodorus suggests to the author the hand of Hellanicus. The

reader is not informed that this is a thorny problem, and that in the opinion of many scholars (for instance Jacoby) the theory of the duplication in Hellanicus is made unlikely by the fragment on the trial of Orestes (169 Jac.). P. goes on to say: 'Julius Africanus tells us that Hellanicus and Philochorus reckoned 1,020 years from the time when Ogygus reigned in Athens to the first Olympiad'—and again the reader is not told that fr. 47a hardly allows us to attribute to Hellanicus what seems to have been Philochorus' opinion. The danger of the method is made more acute by the following sentence: 'The period from Ogygus to Cecrops, according to Philochorus, was 189 years, and in the absence of contradictory evidence, we may assume that here too, as in the date of Ogygus, he is following Hellanicus.' Immediately afterwards we read that 'according to Hellanicus Troy was captured at the beginning of Demophon's reign', but five pages later (p. 17) we are told that the fall of Troy happened, according to Hellanicus, during the reign of Menestheus; it would have been better to analyse the difficult fragment 152 a. Any other page of the book conceals or minimizes the questions arising out of fragments. For instance, one does not see the use of quoting fr. 51 Müller of Philochorus (p. 115) without adding more precisely that Philochorus was perfecting the version of Aeschylus, *Eleusinii*, against Euripides, *Supplices* (Plut. *Thes.* 29). At p. 128 the brief discussion on the altar of Peace omits Aristophanes, *Pax*, and the whole of recent research (cf. L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, 37, and my paper in the Italian *Athenaeum*, 1936).

History of history is almost a superhuman task. It requires good philology, good history, and good philosophy joined together. *Non ignarus mali*, I can sympathize with Mr. Pearson; yet I would that his next book contained more mistakes—and more truth.

ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO.

Oxford.

THE POETICS TRANSLATED

Preston H. EPPS: *The Poetics of Aristotle translated*. Pp. xii+67. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press (London: Milford), 1942. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.

THE object of this work is to provide a translation of the *Poetics* to which all students of the North Carolina Course in Greek Drama 'could have simultaneous access and thus give a common terminology for this work'. It is not clear why Bywater's translation, also published in paper covers (with an introduction by Gilbert Murray), was not good enough; it is more accurate, closer to the Greek, and (in the reviewer's opinion) far clearer in difficult passages and written in much better English. The present translation mainly follows Bywater's text, with occasional deviations into Gudeman's, and now and then passes from translation to paraphrase. As for the best-known difficulties, the translator gives no rendering of *κάθαρσις*, and is not happy over *ἀμαρτία*, *ἦθος* (usually rendered by 'character [indicants]') and *διάνοια*, and he practically makes no attempt to render parts of ch. xxv intelligibly. He is often needlessly long. Thus in ch. i, where Bywater writes (with perfect adequacy) 'whether by art or constant practice', Mr. Epps takes sixteen words; in ch. iv, *τὰς μάλιστ' ἀκριβομένους* has, quite unnecessarily, a sentence to itself, and the first part of this sentence is not justified by the Greek; and in the same chapter *τὸν λόγον πρωταγωνιστὴν παρεσκεύασεν* ('gave the dialogue the chief role') is rendered by 'started the spoken, as opposed to the choral, part on its way to becoming the most important part of tragedy'; *δύναμις* in ch. i is translated by 'function and potential possibilities' (what possibilities are not potential?), *ὄψις* in ch. xiv by 'pageant and spectacle', and so on. There are too many definite errors; e.g. in ch. i *ἐτι δέ* is rendered 'and even' (which does not make sense); in ch. iii *οἱ τε ἐνταῦθα* is either omitted in the translation or mistranslated; in ch. v

'the so-called early comic writers speak of comedy as having already acquired certain forms' treats *μνημονεύονται* as active in sense, and one may well ask what early comedians are likely to have made such a statement. (The sense is, of course, 'It was not until comedy had already certain fixed forms that the record of those to whom the name of comic poet is applied begins.') Later in the same chapter the translator fails to distinguish *μῆκος*, the length of the composition, from *χρόνος*, the imaginary time occupied by the events portrayed, and by perverting the order of the clauses confuses the sense (which is that the *μῆκος* is determined by the *χρόνος*, the *χρόνος* being long in the case of epic, short in the case of tragedy—though at first tragedy did not observe this limit). In ch. vi 'even those who undertake to write tragedy' makes nonsense, as it includes all tragic poets; the sense is, of course, 'even beginners'. In ch. vii *ἐγγὺς τοῦ ἀναισθήτου χρόνου* cannot possibly be 'at close range and in an imperceptible amount of time'. In ch. viii *ὅσον πληγῆσαι μὲν κτλ.* are treated as if they were governed by *οὐκ ἐποίησεν* instead of by *συνέβη*, and *μᾶς τε εἶναι ταύτης καὶ ὅλης* is mistranslated 'must deal with that action and with the whole of it', instead of 'the action which it imitates must be a unity and a whole'. In ch. xv *τοιούτων ἦθος ὑποτιθεῖς* is wrongly rendered, and in one of the examples given in ch. xxi the translator fails to distinguish between *ἀρύσαι* and *ἀφελεῖν*, and makes a sad mess of *προστιθέασιν ἀνθ' οὗ λέγει πρὸς ὃ ἐστι*. I have noted other mistakes, and a larger number of places in which the rendering is just, though not so seriously wrong. I do not mean that a reader of this translation will be misled as to the general drift of the sense, but he will often miss the meaning of particular sentences and phrases, and from the standpoint of both accuracy and style he will be well advised to stick to Bywater.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

THE LOEB PHILO

Philo. With an English translation by F. H. COLSON. In ten volumes. Volume IX. Pp. x+547. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1941. Cloth, 10s. net.

MR. COLSON draws very near to the completion of his great monument of unpretentious scholarship. He interprets Philo without shirking any of the difficulties: his textual suggestions are good (e.g. *Quod omnis probus liber sit* 74 *πρεσβεύεται λόγων έργα*),¹ and he makes helpful observations on many points (e.g. p. 161 on *νοῦς* in *De vita contemplativa* 78 as both 'mind' and 'meaning', as in viii, p. 328, he remarked on *εἰκόσιν* serving as dative of both *εἰκόνας* and *εἰκότα*; p. 521 f. on Philo's relation to the *Symposium*), particularly of lexicography (e.g. p. 308 *πολὺ πρότερον*, 'a much graver matter'; p. 418 *ζῆλος*; p. 420 *εὐθὺς* describing logical consequence—as can *mox*, cf. H. J. Rose, *C.Q.* xxi, 1927, 65; p. 510 *ἀμφιθαλής*; p. 511 *οὕτως* in comparative clauses; p. 512 *ἐτύμως*; p. 538 *ἀναμάττομαι*, where the problem is like that of *τυποῦσθαι* discussed *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xxxiii, 1940, 306; p. 538 *σφαδάζειν*; p. 544 *ἀνεύμων*). These last comments deserve to be entered in the margins of the reader's Liddell-Scott-Jones: as a whole, the Greek of Philo is no less worthy of attention than Plutarch's and no less characteristic of the early Empire.

This volume comprises *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, *De vita contemplativa*, *De aeternitate mundi*, *In Flaccum*, and the Eusebian excerpts from *Hypothetica* and *De providentia*.² To Colson,

as an expert student of Philo, 'the volume . . . is far less interesting than the other eight'. Those of us to whom Philo matters primarily as a source and not as a man may feel otherwise. *Quod omnis, Aet., Prov.* are invaluable as adaptations of Hellenistic types of philosophic writing which we know in fragments and in other reflections. Philo's closeness to his sources is shown by the parallelism between *Aet.* and the condensed argument of Sallustius *Concerning the gods and the universe*, 7 and 17,¹ by 'the familiars of the Olympian gods' in *Quod omnis* 42, and by the unqualified praise of Hellas in *Prov.* ii. 66, 'Greece alone can be truly said to produce mankind', a noteworthy phrase for a pious Jew (contrast *Congr. quae. erud.* 51, *Post. Caini* 92, *Spec. leg.* ii. 163) and yet presumably one which Philo accepted and did not just transcribe.² Closely as he follows his sources, he adapts and does not simply copy,³ and he had reason for profound gratitude to Greece.

He had learned her philosophies from books, and perhaps in a measure from the living voice; as L. Massebieau remarks (*Rev. hist. rel.* liii, 1906, 32), he credits Moses with Greek teachers and may well have had such himself.⁴ Of course, he stood outside their schools and successions, and could not well exercise influence on them; coincidences between him and Plutarch must be ascribed to a common source or sources. In spite of respect for Moses as an early sage and even as a stylist,⁵

¹ Cf. my edition, lx ff.; reference should be made also to R. Harder, *Ocellus Lucanus*, 32, etc., and W. Theiler, *Gnomon*, ii (1926), 590 ff.

² P. Wendland, *Philos Schrift über die Vorlesung*, 2.

³ Cf. Colson, 198 f., 511 f.; note the argument against literalism in *Quod omnis*, 2 (cf. *Somm.* i. 39, 209), with a close parallel to 1 Cor. ix. 9.

⁴ *Leg.* 182 indicates his reputation among Jews for culture; *Alexander*, 7 (viii, p. 103 Richter), shows familiarity with the habits of literary society; 73 (ibid. 134) refers to his training from early years in studies aiming at truth.

⁵ [Longin.] *De sublim.* 9. 9, quoting a phrase of Genes. i which had reached him in some roundabout way, perhaps through Jewish apologetic or echoes of it in speech (*οὐχ ὁ τυχὼν ἀνὴρ* is

¹ Even better than that of Wilamowitz, *Hermes*, liv (1919), 73 *πρεσβεύεται λόγος έργον*. On the other hand, reference might well be made to W.'s conjectures, *ibid.* 72 ff., on 10 and 60, and above all on 96 (*λόγοι*, *λόγοι*) *βραχείς*, ἀλλ' ἔχουσι δύναμιν [καὶ] μακαριότητα and 118 (*Βροῦτος Κασίων*); and to A. Brinkmann's *καθ' ἓνα μὲν τρόπον* for *καθ' ἓν μὲν πρῶτον* in *Aet.* 4 (*Rh. Mus.* lxxii, 1918, 319).

² The latter edited with constant reference to the Armenian version of the entire text. A translation by Professor R. Marcus of the Philonic material only thus preserved is to appear in the Loeb edition.

writings in which the authority of Moses was invoked would have fallen under such condemnation as Galen voices.¹ Later, a respect for such authority, at least for that of the *Logia Chaldaica*, found a place; but is there any indication of the use of Jewish tradition save in Numenius,² and any demonstrable acquaintance with Philo even in his fragments? He, like us, would have had to extract Philo's thought: there is no declared system, no methodical treatise setting forth principles. Instead, to all appearances there is a mosaic—or rather a variety of mosaics.

Quod omnis, Aet., Prov., and Alexander or concerning the possession of reason by unreasoning animals form a group of treatises presenting Greek thought in Greek sequences, with no more than a few incidental references to Jewish revelation; and *Prov., Aet., Alex.*, like Cicero's philosophical works, state fully from the standpoint of those who hold them views which are finally rejected.³ Wendland, who has done most for our understanding of these works, ascribed them to an early period in Philo's life, antedating his main work of exegesis, in which there are indeed some Greek sequences, but Greek thought is usually employed for the interpretation of the Old Testament rather than presented

reminiscent of Strab. xvi. 2. 36, p. 761, which is almost certainly Posidonian, *συνεστήσατο ἀρχὴν οὐ τὴν τυχεύσαν*. The reference to Moses as *ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεομότης* instead of *ὁ τ. ἱ. νομοθέτης* is peculiar: cf. Colson, p. 509, on *θεομότης* as contrasted with *νόμος*: it is barely possible that it involves the Posidonian distinction between Moses as responsible for the basic monotheism of the Jews, and later legalism as the product of successors).

¹ *De usu partium*, xi. 14; *De pulsuum differentiis*, ii. 4 (viii, p. 579 K.); cf. iii. 3 (p. 657).

² So again, Plotinus might possibly have learned of him from Origen or from Numenius' writings (Porph. *V. Plot.* 14), but would certainly have disapproved. It is noteworthy that Porphyry *ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl.* vi. 19. 8, accuses Origen of borrowing his allegorical methods from Chaeremon and Cornutus, and does not bring in Philo. Celsus shows knowledge of Hellenistic Jewish thought and possibly of Philo's writings (E. Stein, *Eos*, xxxiv, 1932-3, 205 ff.), but he had a controversial motive for acquiring such knowledge.

³ The rejection in *Aet.*—perhaps brief, as in *Alex.*—is now lost, but clearly foreshadowed (150).

in its own right. This is an attractive idea, but far from certain. *Quod omnis*, though defending a Stoic paradox, stands by itself; but *Prov., Aet., Alex.* are closely linked, as H. Leisegang has emphasized in an instructive paper in which he protests against any description of them as 'beginner's exercises'.¹ Now in *Alex.* a discourse by a young kinsman, Alexander, is read, and in *Prov.* Alexander is an interlocutor. He is generally identified with Philo's nephew Tiberius Julius Alexander, who later abandoned Judaism and had a distinguished career in the service of Rome. If the identification is correct (and it is certainly probable),² we have to reckon with a man who was *epi-strategos* of the Thebais in 42, procurator of Palestine between 45 and 48, and governor of Egypt in 68-9, and therefore probably born not far from A.D. 10: when he figured as a leading participant in a philosophic discussion he can hardly have been appreciably under twenty, certainly not under eighteen; he had been on a mission to Rome (54), which makes twenty look like a minimum; further, he cannot yet have left Judaism, which he must have done before 42.³ Accordingly, *Prov.* and *Alex.* may be dated near 30, and *Aet.* probably goes with them.

This is not incredible: the Ciceronian character of the *Dialogus* of Tacitus is now seen to be no proof of early date: a Greek or Roman writer with literary

¹ *Philol.* xcii (1937), 153 ff.; *ibid.* 173, an excellent defence of *τὸ ὁπάρειν* in *Aet.* 20.

² G. Tappe, in his excellent dissertation, *De Philonis libro qui inscribitur 'Ἀλέξανδρος ἢ περὶ τοῦ λόγου ἔχειν τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα* (Gött. 1912), 4 f., raises some doubts, based on the perplexing language of *Alex.* 2. 75. Certainty is not attainable, but Tappe is clearly right in postulating a textual error in 2, and there may be more such: the relationships involved would be of minimal interest to later readers and scribes.

³ *Alex.* is proved by an allusion in 27 to be not before A.D. 12. E. R. Goodenough, *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, 64, showed the lateness of *Alex.*: but his date of birth for Tiberius Julius Alexander, 'not much if any before A.D. 20', is too late to be compatible with the appointment in the Thebais. (We may recall the question which Alcibiades when not yet twenty asked Pericles, *Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 40 ff.: it did not require philosophical knowledge.)

ability adopted the style appropriate to a particular genre.¹ Philo was capable of producing at any period of his maturity these exercises in a markedly different manner. Indeed, if the Alexander identification is sound, he may have been stimulated by the intellectual coming of age of this brilliant young relative.² Various ancients wrote works addressed to their sons: in general, anything like a dedication was in antiquity sometimes more than the courtesy which it is to-day.

When I speak of a group of exercises I do not mean that these works were simply *jeux d'esprit*, like the forlorn venture of Augustus in drama, or dialectical chess-games played with no personal concern. Leisegang thinks of Philo as seriously interested in the defence of Stoic principles: there may be an element of this in his attitude, but his other works show a mind in which various interests lived side by side and religion generally came first. *Alex.* looks academic, and Philo's rebuttal does not mention the unique status of man in the O.T.: yet he concludes (100) 'desinamus igitur obmurmurare contra naturam et impietatem subire'. *Aet.*, however, has clear repercussions on revelation: creation *ex nihilo* was not necessary to Philo, but creation was, and the controversy later concerned Christian and Mohammedan theology. As for *Prov.*, it raised issues vital to any theism: in later Rabbinic writings, the name of Epicurean serves as a category of condemnation.³ Re-

ligious interest is particularly clear in two works, which though not of this group indicate in their titles issues formulated by Greek thought, *Quod omnis*, and *De vita contemplativa*. In the first, a paradox with the value of an act of faith is exemplified by the Essenes—who show the Stoic ideal realized:¹ in the second, the Jewish Therapeutai, as representatives of the contemplative life, are set in contrast to the Essenes, now treated as a type of the active life, and the whole interest lies in an idealized portrayal of what seemed to Philo the best of Judaism.²

Another literary exercise by Philo outside his ordinary range, and on an issue of vital importance to him, as to all Jews, is the *Hypothetica*. It is an essay in apologetic, having much in common with the *Contra Apionem* of Josephus,³ e.g. the exaggeration of the rigour of punishments in the Jewish

different way Plut. *Sto. rep.* 38, p. 1051 E. The combination of Christians and Epicureans in Lucian, *Alex.* 38, is the more piquant.

¹ I still reject the view of H. Box, approved by E. R. Goodenough (*J. Bibl. Lit.* lix, 1940, 59), that *Quod omnis*, 6-7, refers to the position of the Jews at Alexandria. The objection in *C.R.* liv (1940), 170, from the supposedly early date of the treatise, must be withdrawn; but Philo's antithesis of citizens and refugees is simply parallel to those of rich and poor, slave and free, and is a plain paradox.

In *De virt.* iv. 190 ff. Philo gives a more religious treatment of the theme of *Quod omnis* (Colson, viii, p. xvii): here too the base man is *ipso facto* an expatriate.

² With Philo's divergent treatments of the Essenes (Colson, 106 n.), cf. his diametrically opposite views of Joseph (Colson, vi, p. xii).—The description of the Therapeutai is marked by an idyllic romanticism: Colson is no doubt right in thinking that the settlement was small and ephemeral (cf. the various modern colonies of single-taxers, etc.). *De vita cont.* 80 on their hymns in various metres might have an element of truth, since virtuosity could count as a mark of piety (cf. Nock, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xxvii, 1934, 61), but is probably a mere phrase: cf. Joseph. *Ant. Jud.* ii. 346; iv. 303, on hexametric songs by Moses. On the Therapeutai see in general I. Heinemann, *Pauly-Wissowa*, v A. 2321 ff.

³ Colson, 409 n., and above all P. Wendland, *Fleck. Jahrb. Suppl.* xxii (1896), 709 ff. (*ibid.* 714 f. on the meaning of its title). The discussion of the sabbath and the sabbatical year refutes by implication such charges as appear in Tac. *Hist.* v. 4 (cf. Phil. *Somm.* ii. 123 for a clash with Roman authority on the former).

¹ Cf. above all Fr. Leo, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1898, 175 ff.—*De plantatione*, among the exegetical works, has a substantial section on the question 'Will the wise man get drunk?' in a comparable style of argumentation (Leisegang, 165) without the dialogue setting, which *Aet.* also lacks. The source of this is probably, as Colson urges, iii. 209, of an epideictic nature—perhaps a paradox proposed by way of jest, like the contention of Socrates in Plat. *Symp.* 223 D about dramatic poetry: it is not a Stoic paradox, for Zeno argued against it.

² Cf. the indication, *Prov.* ii. 115 (p. 100, Richter), of discussions to come.

³ Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, ii. 387 f.; H. Danby, *The Mishnah*, 397, n. 4. In Galen, *De usu partium*, xi. 14, Moses and Epicurus are the extreme opposites: cf. Hor. *Sat.* i. 5. 100 ff., and in a

code (*Ap.* ii. 215 ff.: cf. *Ant. Jud.* i. 23); the severest standards (equal, though the point is not made, to those of the Stoic as parodied by *Hor. Sat.* i. 3) were here enforced. Philo's Essenes come in again, to show the visible exemplification of the highest: they are the wonder of kings and commoners (*II.* 18, p. 442). Josephus, in his *Jewish Antiquities*, sometimes minimizes the miraculous or says of this or that supernatural feature 'the reader may think as he will':¹ he was representing Judaism as a 'wisdom', and wearing the mask of a classical historian. Philo, apart from other divergences,² goes further, and rests his main contention not upon the Bible but upon facts which adversaries admitted—that the Jews were led through the desert, that they won Palestine, that they received a code.³

The course of events under Caligula involved Philo not only in a mission to Rome but also in writings of yet another type, now represented by *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium* (which latter is to appear in volume x), the two works of Philo most familiar to students of classical antiquity. One point in the first may now be considered, since (if I am not mistaken) a textual suggestion of Colson's opens a new historical per-

spective. Philo protests (48 f.) against the closing of the synagogues as depriving the Jews of their way of showing their reverence to their (Imperial) benefactors, *τὴν εἰς τοὺς εὐεργέτας εὐσέβειαν*, and describes their places of prayer as 'the bases of their piety towards the Augustan house', *ὁμηγήρια τῆς εἰς τὸν Σεβαστὸν οἶκον δούσης*.¹ He proceeds to say of this homage (50): 'If we neglect to pay it when our institutions permit we should deserve the utmost penalty for not tendering our requital with all due fullness. But if we fall short because it is forbidden by our own laws, which Augustus also was well pleased to confirm, I do not see what offence, either small or great, can be laid to our charge. The only thing for which we might be blamed would be that we transgressed, though involuntarily, by not defending ourselves against the defections from our customs, which even if originally due to others often ultimately affect even those who are responsible for them': *τοὺς αἰρίους* can just be translated as 'those who are responsible by having allowed others to begin': but sense and balance demand what Colson suggests (p. 331), *τοὺς (μὴ) αἰρίους* or *τοὺς ἀναρίους*, 'the innocent'. Now this may be simply a moral observation, 'we are chastened for our sins',² and of course the feeling of racial moral solidarity was particularly strong among the Jews. Yet we may recall that very soon after these events of A.D. 38, in fact in 41, Claudius commands the Jews of Alexandria 'not to busy themselves about anything beyond what they have held hitherto, and not henceforth, as if they lived in two cities, to send two embassies—a thing such as never occurred before now—nor to try to force their way into gymnasiarchic or *kosmetic*

¹ Cf. i. 108 (with Thackeray's note), ii. 347 f., iii. 8, 322; *C. Ap.* ii. 160. He sometimes intensifies the miraculous (*Ant. Jud.* v. 284 is parallel to the miracle of *Hor. Sat.* i. 5. 99. Cf. L. Bieler, *Θεὸς Ἀρχὴ*, ii. 27). I hope to return elsewhere to the Jewish attitude towards miracles, and to contrast early Christian attitudes.

² Bieler, *op. cit.*, 25 ff., and I. Heinemann, *Pauly-Wissowa*, xvi. 374 f.

³ Heinemann, *ibid.* 369 f. When Philo speaks of divine monitions 'through visions and dreams' to the Jews to leave Egypt, he speaks of the types of supernatural commands most widely recognized in the Gentile world: cf. *De somn.* i. 1 f., also *V. Mos.* i. 1, 'Moses whom some describe as the lawgiver of the Jews, others as the interpreter of (*ἐρμηνεύς*: perhaps 'intermediary bringing') the holy laws', and I. Heinemann, *Philons griech. u. jüd. Bildung*, 477, on his willingness to treat laws as resulting from personal decisions of Moses, which do not for him need to be unassisted human reasoning: cf. Heinemann, *Pauly-Wissowa*, v A. 2325: the passage of Strabo discussed in p. 77, note 5, *supra*, represents Moses as bidding people sleep in the temple to secure dreams (as in the regular pagan practice of incubation).

¹ Neither *εὐσέβεια* nor *δουήσης* implies deification, but they are certainly the strongest words for 'proper dutiful attitude' toward powers ordained of God (*Rom.* xiii. 1) that Philo could use: he is going as far as he can.

² Cf. *Spec. leg.* i. 55, on the merit of taking personal action against wrongdoers. For 'defections', *τὰς ἐκδιαρρήσεις τῶν ἐθνῶν*, cf. the passages cited by Box *ad loc.*, and also *Vit. Mos.* i. 31 *ἐκδεδιγρημένοι*.

contests.¹ This is now generally, and I think rightly, interpreted as referring to two rival legations from the Jews of Alexandria, possibly (as H. Willrich urged)² one from conservative orthodox Jews and one from hellenizing Jews desirous of the status conferred by membership of the gymnasium and not shrinking from any of its concomitants. In any event, there was a division of sentiment, and some Jews were trying to enter the gymnasium. Is not Philo alluding to this situation? And is it not probable that the leaders of the Alexandrian Greeks had made capital out

¹ H. I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, p. 25, ll. 89 ff. (accepting *ἐνεσπαιεω* from E. Schwartz for *ἐνεσπαιεω*).

² *Herm.* lx (1925), 482 ff.; cf. H. I. Bell, *J. Rom. Stud.* xxxi (1941), 10. Willrich identified Philo with the hellenizing wing. He was, however, insistent on the letter of the law; and, though he might have supported a Jewish claim to a theoretical right of entering the gymnasium as the prerequisite of Alexandrian citizenship, he would not have countenanced any violation of the Mosaic code. The suggestion that the embassy under Caligula asked for actual citizenship seems to me doubtful: *πρωτοβουλία*, in *Leg(atio)* 183, refers simply to Caligula's promise to hear the delegation before others which awaited an audience, and *Leg.* 370-1 implies that the Jewish position in Alexandria was identical with that in other Greek cities. They may have asked for more than they expected to get: presumably they sought the *de jure* confirmation of their *de facto* situation before Flaccus had acted. (Incidentally, Caligula's orders in *Leg.* 344 confirm the view expressed in *Camb. Anc. Hist.* x. 496, that the Jewish destruction of an altar at Jamnia provoked Caligula's order to Petronius to erect a statue in the Temple at Jerusalem.)

of it? If Lampon and Isidorus said in effect, 'The Jewish objection on religious grounds to the presence of representations of Caligula in their synagogues is insincere: why, plenty of their own people are only too eager to come into the gymnasia and do not mind the sight of images of Hermes and Heracles and the divine emperor',¹ Philo could not deny the fact. So we understand the tortuous obscurity of his language:² it is like the ambiguous reference of Paul in Galatians, ii. 3-4 to the circumcision of Titus, 'Not even Titus, who was with me and a Gentile, was compelled to be circumcised, but by reason of false brethren . . .', when probably his opponents had said 'Titus was circumcised', and the fact could not be denied.³

These notes may serve to emphasize the interest of this volume; in conclusion, it is proper to repeat how much we owe to Mr. Colson for his superb work, and to remark that Messrs. R. and R. Clark of Edinburgh maintain their usual skill as printers.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK.

Harvard University.

¹ Cf. J. Oehler, *Pauly-Wissowa*, vii. 2023, and the cults of Attalids in the gymnasium at Cos (R. Herzog, *Abh. Berl. Akad.* 1928, vi. 26).

² Cf. the passing reference in *Leg.* 161 to the few Jews who were guilty in the episode under Tiberius.

³ Nock, *St. Paul*, 107 f.; cf. Paul's own *Tu quoque* in Gal. vi. 13.

THE PRINCETON PAPYRI

Allan Chester JOHNSON and Sidney Pullman GOODRICH: *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*, Vol. III. Pp. xii+124. Princeton: Princeton University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, \$3.

WITH the present volume the publication of the Princeton Papyri is completed. As might be expected, it contains a certain proportion of those less attractive pieces which an editor is always tempted to leave for later consideration, but the volume includes several noteworthy items. Literary texts are few and unimportant; they are printed with the modern accents

and breathings, not as written in the papyri, which is a departure from practice and not a commendable one. They are: *Iliad*, i. 209-39; i. 216-37, 574-97; iv. 378-84; vi. 1-15, 25-39; Xenophon, *Hellenica*; Isocrates, *Antidosis*; a medical treatise; and a philosophical (?) treatise, apparently from a codex, which is noteworthy in a papyrus assigned to the second or third century.

Of documentary texts the most remarkable are: 119, a petition concerning an estate the owners of which had been accused of evading payment of their taxes; 136, a land register of the fourth-fifth century, important for

Byzantine taxation; 151, an interesting lease of 'immortal' female slaves, i.e. slaves leased on condition that in case of death they shall be replaced by an equivalent; 159, an amulet against fever; 166, an interesting letter on a funeral; and 169, if the editors are justified in reading in l. 3 of this fifth-century letter ἐραστής γεγένημαι τῆς σῆς θ[υγατρός], but this seems a little too good to be true, though I can suggest no alternative to ἐραστής.

The editors have done their work well, though the commentary is a little jejune, and one suspects at times an imperfect feeling for Greek idiom. I doubt, for instance, several renderings in 119. Surely, in l. 12 *καὶ τὴν νομήν εἶχεν* means 'he enjoyed possession of it', not 'put into pasturage'; in l. 14 *νεμηθέντων κτλ.* seems to mean that the sons had possession after their father's death, not 'the estate was divided among' them; and in l. 17 I see no need to supply *μή* but should render 'the new vineyard was divided even (ἐν) during their father's lifetime'. No. 120 is certainly not a petition but a letter of the usual Byzantine type; and 121 seems to be an undertaking to produce the man in court (note *τὰ πρὸς αὐτ[ὸν] ἐπιζητούμενα*), not an oath of surety. In 124, 12, as *προσενεγκάμενων* is middle, 'reported (passive) as unable' does violence to the Greek. Is

not the meaning 'who were registered as metropolitans and according to the minutes . . . submitted that they were unable to prove their status'? So, too, in 127, 9, not 'listed by us' but 'who made returns to us'. In l. 13 should *ἡμεῖν* be corrected to *ὕμεῖν*? In 139, 7 it is startling to find a Christian emperor described as *θεοῦ*. The word is not marked as doubtful; is *κυρίου* quite impossible? In 140 I suggest the following readings: I recto, 1, 8 *δ(ιὰ) τ(ῶν) τέκνω(ν)*; I verso, 1, 10 *εἰσοφυλίτ(ου) (l. εἰσωπ.)*; I verso, 2, 2 *ἅπα Δί(ου) = I recto, 2, 5 ἅπα Δί(ου)*; II recto, 1, 7 *Ἀνδρέο(ν), 15 δ(ιὰ) τ(ῶν) τεκτωνο(ν) (l. τεκτόνων)*; II verso, 2, 20 *σιγνοφύλαξ* ('warder of the prison'). In 150, 1, 17 *qu. διὰ μὲν τῶν πρ[ὸς] καταλοχ(ισμοῖς) κατ(οίκων)]?* In 152, 1, 4 *qu. Ταβο]υρίωι (cf. 2, 16)?* In 164, 8 *ἐκπλέξωμεν αὐτό*, surely means 'we shall get the matter straight'; in 166, 7 *ἀναπλεύσω* is not 'sail back' but 'sail up' the Nile; in 174, 2, 1, etc., the participles are presumably in the dative (I suspect that this fragment comes from the Heroninus archive). And in 165, 10 ff. *κυρία ἐστὶ ἡ γένεσις* seems a queer way of saying 'it is my official birthday'. Would not the sense be better rendered by the phrase familiar in a popular game, 'this is a solemn occasion'? In 169, 2 read *θαν[μασιότητος] ὕμων (or σοῦ)*.

British Museum.

H. I. BELL.

PORTUGUESE LATIN

Norman P. SACKS: *The Latinity of Dated Documents in the Portuguese Territory*. (University of Pennsylvania: Series in Romance Languages, No. 32.) Pp. ix+179. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941. Paper, \$2.

MR. SACKS has investigated the linguistic peculiarities of the documents belonging to the Portuguese area and written during the period A.D. 770-1192. These documents, mainly of a notarial character, are to be found in *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica* and some additional collections. Mr. Sacks quotes and classifies words and usages which illustrate developments of vulgar Latin generally, but in particular and with

greater fullness those which are in line with the presumed movement of the local vernacular. Throughout he makes constant reference to two text-books which together cover both aspects of his subject, namely, Grandgent's *Vulgar Latin* and Williams's *From Latin to Portuguese*.

For the student of this 'barbarous' Latin Mr. Sacks's collections are important, and he has arranged his material well. Only on some matters of detail may criticism be offered. Pp. 15, 16: it is difficult to see why *domingo = dominicum, auctorgo = auctoriticum*, and some others should be included in the section illustrating the fall of the intertonic vowel; and *sol-*

dorum = *solidorum* does not itself exemplify the fall of a post-tonic penult but is secondary to *soldus*. P. 21: it is hard to believe that in *dinoxitur* = *dinoscitur* *x* is a reverse spelling attesting the occasional change by metathesis of *x* to *sk*. It is far easier to believe that in *dinoxitur*, as well as in *xeleraadis* = *sceleratis*, *x* is simply a variant spelling of *s*; that *sc* before *e* and *i* can be confused with *s* is shown by *suseptione* = *susceptionem* (p. 44) and *scia* = *sia* = *sedeat* (p. 71). For the curious forms *adueo*, *adbes*, *adueaditis* Mr. Sacks suggests a form *adbeo* derived from *adhibeo* by the proportion *praehibeo*:*praebeo*::*adhibeo*:*adbeo*. But did *praehibeo* exist at this late period to provide the first term of this proportion? In any case, when discussing the usages of *habeo* on p. 153, the author apparently takes *adbes* = *habes*, a more likely view.

However inadequate a picture the Latin of such documents may give of

the contemporary linguistic scene, there is no doubt that many of its forms are due to the pressure of everyday pronunciation and usage upon scribes whose ambition is to write Latin. It is interesting therefore to find many instances of so peculiarly a Portuguese feature as the loss of intervocalic *l* and *n*, as well as a number of vowel changes which are in line with Portuguese developments. There are also many examples where forms of *stare* and *sedere* represent the corresponding forms of *esse*, as well as an occasional use of *teneo* as an auxiliary. Although these latter and some other features are Iberian rather than Portuguese, we may allow Mr. Sacks's claim to have added in some degree to the natural probability that Portuguese existed as a separate language a century before 1192, the date of the first Portuguese document.

J. W. PIRIE.

University of Glasgow.

STUDIES IN CIVILISATION

Studies in Civilisation. University of Pennsylvania Bicentennial Conference. Pp. vi+200. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press (London: Milford), 1941. Cloth, 9s. net.

THE University of Pennsylvania has celebrated its bicentenary by a volume containing twelve *Studies in Civilisation*, which range from the Aegean Bronze Age to World Currents in American Civilisation. Only four of them require notice here in detail; but mention must be made of Professor Osgood's 'Literature and Learning' and of Professor Entwistle's 'Search for the Heroic Poem', because they deal with questions common to all great periods of culture, and offer much that is helpful to classical students.

Professor Wace limits himself to the 'Mycenaean Civilisation' of the Greek mainland as presented at Mycenae and similar but smaller centres. The words 'Crete', 'Cretan', and 'Minoan' occur near the end in three phrases only, to distinguish insular language from that of the mainland; an amusing specialism and undesigned foil to Professor

Schlesinger's presentation of 'American Civilisation' in the last of these essays. But the paper is descriptive and static; even within these limits there is little to suggest development, though (p. 2) 'a period of two hundred years gives time for changes to be noted'. Is it, however, possible 'to envisage it as a whole', or 'to estimate its value' without at least looking forward, if not also back? Professor Wace has indeed this excuse: he feels 'that it is right to recognize in the Mycenaeans the same Greek spirit which led the world in art, in science, and in literature' and 'the earliest expression of the Greek genius' (p. 22). But this is a hard saying, and needs better demonstration than the belief that the first Greeks entered Greece about 2000 B.C. (p. 21). That the unread tablets of Pylos 'suggest a different language from that of Minoan Crete' does not prove them to have been written in Greek: the same argument applied within Crete itself would prove *either* Script A or Script B—and therefore *both*—to be Greek also. On a technical point, in what sense is the term 'cantilever' applicable to the

galleries at Tiryns? (p. 19). And had the Mycenaeans the domestic fowl (p. 7)? If they had, it was one of the few material things they did not owe to Crete.

'Exact Science in Antiquity' gives Professor Neugebauer the occasion to outline a wide range of intricate inquiries, which will surely find ampler exposition elsewhere. The centre of interest in the history of science lies, as he says (p. 23), 'in the relationship between methods', and in most periods of science sound and unsound methods are in use concurrently: the work of Ptolemy, here analysed, is an example. The 'interruption' of pure mathematics in Greece, after Archimedes and Apollonius, is attributed to the 'geometrical language' which it might have outlived, and accounts, in turn, for the small influence exercised on other studies, less rigorous and mainly borrowed from Babylonia. The point is happily illustrated by the mixture of contradictory elements in Hellenistic culture generally, which transmitted number-symbolism and other fetishes to Christian and Arabian thinkers. But the Babylonian mathematical astronomy itself, unlike its mathematical basis, was not ancient; it was its novelty, as well as Parthian aggression, that introduced it to Hellenistic contemporaries. A most interesting observation connects algebraic notation with the Semitic adoption of Sumerian pictographs both as sound-symbols and as ideograms, representing by a single sign a single concept one or more words long. There was a similar but even neater device in Minoan script, perhaps in similar circumstances; while Egypt, immune to language-problems, never made this vital adaptation.

'Artistic and Intellectual' are the essential and enduring contributions of Greece; and their interconnexions are analysed by Professor Ferguson with luminous examples, and a pocket-book of *apophthegmata* (pp. 43-6) which it would be hard to better. 'The cultivation of art and the cultivation of intelligence complemented each other' (p. 34), fostered by individual and

by general will alike: 'clarity and universality' is a concise formula for this ideal. Its persistence through what are presented as five main phases, and across the whole extent of the Greek microcosm, was favoured by community of language, centralization of creative ability in successive 'unifiers of Greece'—Ionia, Athens, Alexandria; one might add the general uniformity of external conditions, and the relative simplicity of Greek economic and social life: 'to hear some new thing' you must have leisure and security against want and violence. Political liberty 'meant also social liberty', based on that 'justice' which found voice in 'law', political and aesthetic alike, and had 'moderation' rather as corollary than as principle. The contributions of the successive phases of Hellenism were distinct and characteristic. Homer 'humanized so completely the national deities' (p. 40) that thought was emancipated from religious control: one should perhaps allow that 'Homer' had his opportunity in the débâcle of the old cosmology, no less than of the 'divine kings'. The tyrants released men from fear of privilege, the physicists from fear of unreason in nature. The great age of democracy created a philosophy of the State, constructive first, then critical; its sequel, when 'city-state sciences languished in turn with the decay of the city-states', separated ethics from politics, with alternative ideals of man's place in nature and society, and found place ever for 'some new thing' in the special sciences—mechanics, medicine, philology.

For Roman Law, Professor Boak emphasizes original dependence on interpretation by magistrate and juriconsult, gradual acceptance of a 'law of nations' in practical life, and of a 'law of nature' from Greek thought, and eventual rationalization in terms of Greek jurisprudence. The changes from the older traditional law to the *Corpus Iuris Civilis* he ascribes mainly to imperial legislation on the advice of a new category of administrative experts; and he inclines to minimize their significance, except in so far as Jus-

tinian, for example, had to take account of 'the practical needs of his day' (p. 55). Oriental elements also, he thinks, have been overestimated, and even that Hellenistic influence which was hailed as a discovery not very long

ago. The *Corpus* may therefore be accepted as embodying the highest achievements of Roman jurisprudence; a sober and satisfactory conclusion.

JOHN L. MYRES.

Oxford.

NECROLYNTHIA

Excavations at Olynthus, Part XI: Necrolynthia. By David M. ROBINSON, with the assistance of Frank P. ALBRIGHT and an appendix by John Lawrence ANGEL. Pp. xxvii+279; 71 plates, 26 figures in text. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 90s. net.

THE scope of this volume is indicated by its sub-title, 'a study of Greek burial customs and anthropology'. Part I records the character and contents in bones and funeral offerings of 598 graves, dating from the end of the sixth century B.C. to the middle of the fourth, unearthed mainly in three extramural cemeteries, the North, the Riverside, and the East. An excellent series of plates illustrates a very large and representative number of the various types of burial. Part II has chapters on (i) the cemeteries: their location, monuments, chronology, and the depth and orientation of the graves; (ii) cremation burials; (iii) inhumations; and (iv) *kterismata* (vases, figurines, coins, jewellery, etc.). Both here and in Part I these *kterismata* are dealt with in the most general terms: there are no detailed descriptions or illustrations of the offerings, but indexes and concordances (pp. 241 ff.) refer the reader to the volumes in which they are figured and discussed. An appendix by Mr. J. L. Angel treats of the skeletons and of the ethnological affinities of the ancient Olynthians. Anthropologists will give this appendix a special welcome. The present reviewer can only record his respectful admiration.

Of the 598 burials 53 were cremations, the rest inhumations. Wooden coffins with iron nails are common; tile graves of various types commoner still. In about one-quarter of the whole number of burials the bodies had been placed

in large jars (mainly amphorae, a few hydriae, craters, pithoi, etc.). Stone sarcophagi were rare. Many burials, some of them multiple, showed no coffin or its equivalent; but these unprotected inhumations do not seem, to judge from the objects found in them, to have been those of the poor; the multiple inhumations are conjectured by R. to have been victims of war rather than plague. The fine, painted chamber tomb 598 forms an isolated find. Tombstones are conspicuous by their absence. A single intramural child burial leads to a discussion of intramural burials in general (pp. 127 ff.); the numerous burials in jars to a discussion of the practice of exposing infants, on which R. comes to the comforting conclusion (p. 172) that its popularity was confined mainly to theory and mythology.

The general character of the offerings buried with the dead is discussed in Chapter IV, where (p. 177) we are given a tabulated list of the various objects—vases of various shapes, lamps (rare), terracottas, coins (generally from the mouth of the dead), astragaloi, strigils, and personal ornaments. Only one needle is recorded. In the numerous references to ancient authorities and to other excavations I have only noticed one statement that needs qualification: on p. 179, in reference to the way offerings were placed in Rhitsona graves, R. states as the rule there what was only one of several different practices; for obvious reasons he does not give a reference to the full account of Rhitsona modes of burial recently published in Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. to Vol. XVI, pp. 495 ff., s.v. 'Mykalessos'. All these Olynthus finds have been, or are to be, published and illustrated in other volumes of the Olynthus publications: coins in VI and IX, other metal

objects in X, vases in V, figurines in VII. Some readers may feel that it would be more satisfactory if all the material from each grave (bones, coffin, etc., and kterismata) had been published together to be sorted out by each student according to the nature of his particular interests. That is the method of publication which enables those who come after to put themselves most nearly in the position of the excavator. But anyone who has ever had to record a large amount of material like this, not mainly of the quality of 'museum pieces', will know the difficulties confronting the excavator who wishes to give a conscientious record of his finds, and will hardly quarrel with Professor Robinson if he has chosen a method by

which particular volumes will each have a particular appeal to one particular group of specialists and even more general readers. (Cf. for the latter his preface to this volume, with quotations from Lucian's *Dialogues of the Dead*, *Hamlet*, *Dr. Faustus*, Shakespeare's own epitaph at Stratford, Gray's *Elegy*, *The Burial of Sir John Moore*, *Childe Harold*, Anna Jane Vardill's *Lines to a Skull*, and *The Pliocene Skull* by Bret Harte.) It is, when all is said, mainly a matter of presentation. The essential fact about the Olynthus excavations is that the record is all there. Excavators of other ancient cemeteries please copy.

P. N. URE.

University of Reading.

EPIGRAPHICA ATTICA

Benjamin Dean MERITT: *Epigraphica Attica*. (Martin Classical Lectures, Vol. IX.) Pp. xi+157; 17 photographs, 5 line-drawings. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1940. Cloth, 11s. 6d. net.

THIS charming volume, as attractive in form as it is typographically perfect, is the work of one who for many years past has admittedly stood in the front rank of Greek epigraphists. It reproduces substantially four lectures, entitled respectively 'Readings', 'Reconstruction', 'Lettering', and 'Restoration', delivered in Oberlin College towards the end of 1939, though the precise form of their oral presentation has been somewhat modified so as to suit the conventional requirements of a published book; a number of notes and references are added at the close of the lectures, and the volume ends with a useful index of inscriptions cited.

The work is short (the actual letterpress of the lectures occupies less than a hundred pages) and easily handled, but it is marked by that combination of lucidity and scientific accuracy which only a master can attain. Even the expert epigraphist will learn much from its pages, though it does not aim primarily at the presentation of new materials and results, while at the same

time the veriest amateur will read it with enjoyment and feel something of its fascination as he finds himself introduced into the atelier of the master and initiated into the methods whereby the epigraphical memorials of antiquity are handled so as to make them yield their maximum contribution to our knowledge of the ancient world. The various processes are exemplified by well-selected instances of their application, chosen almost entirely from the field of Attic inscriptions (hence the title of the book), and the brilliant photographic illustrations of specific stones in which the book abounds enable the reader to study these records only less well—indeed, for many purposes even better—than if he stood before the actual monuments. As an exposition of the principal methods of epigraphical study it could hardly be bettered, and it fills admirably a serious gap previously existing in the literature dealing with the subject.

The author's central theme, as defined by himself, is 'to show by example that inscriptions cannot be studied satisfactorily without proper attention to the physical properties of the stones on which they were inscribed', or, in other words, 'to emphasize the importance to the text of a knowledge of its medium'. His work thus serves as

a brief, but highly interesting and inspiring introduction to that science and art (for it is a combination of both) known as 'architectural epigraphy', in the development of which American scholars, among them W. B. Dinsmoor and the author of the work before us, have played so outstanding a part.

The first lecture emphasizes the progress made in epigraphical studies since the time of August Boeckh, due largely to the reinforcement of the 'two-dimensional' manuscript copies of inscriptions by squeezes, drawings, and photographs, the comparative advantages and drawbacks of which are fully and illuminatingly discussed, with a number of warnings and suggestions based mainly on the writer's personal experience. The second lecture develops the contention that 'every inscription should be studied not only as a text but as an architectural monument', stresses the importance of the discovery and observation of the exact position of margins, illustrates the mistakes caused by the neglect of this precaution, and insists that the student must consider the inscribed document 'in the light of all noticeable characteristics of the stele, including the sides, the top, the bottom, and even the back', together with its mouldings, sculptured decoration and other adornments, characteristic faults or flaws, and the lines of fracture of a broken stone. Lecture III is concerned chiefly with the use of letter-forms as a criterion of date and abounds in shrewd observations, alike stressing the importance of a careful study of the 'more or less continuous development throughout the Hellenic and Hellenistic periods' shown by the lettering of Attic inscriptions and warning the student against exaggerated

claims and unjustified dogmatism. It also contains an interesting passage directly connecting the abundance of public documents discovered in Athens with the democratic form of government there in force, so that 'democracy left behind a record and achieved an immortality that has been denied to the interludes of tyranny and oligarchy', while valuable sections are also devoted to the attempted identification of individual hands, something relatively new in the technique of Attic epigraphy, and to the question of the use or neglect of the stoichedon pattern, the study of which has been placed on a fresh and firm foundation by R. P. Austin's *The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions*. The concluding lecture deals with the problems attending the restoration of mutilated texts, examines its legitimate methods and limits, and discusses its justification in cases where no more is attainable than a varying degree of probability. From the story, told in some detail, of one small fragment of the famous assessment-list of 425 the author illustrates 'the slow and tedious way in which the efforts of many people combine to bring at last a satisfactory solution', returning in his final paragraph to an emphatic reassertion that 'restoration and reconstruction must go hand in hand. No epigraphist should propose a text unless he is familiar with the monument on which it was once inscribed, and the physical features of that monument must inevitably condition any proposed restoration'.

A rich store of pertinent criticism and salutary counsel, rendered the more palatable by the unfailing modesty and good temper with which they are administered.

MARCUS N. TOD.

Oriel College, Oxford.

GREEK DEMOCRACY

W. R. AGARD: *What Democracy meant to the Greeks*. Pp. xii+278. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 18s. 6d. net.

THE author of this work on Greek democracy was a colleague of the reviewer for one memorable term,

twenty-three years ago, at Amherst College in Massachusetts. For the last sixteen years he has been on the staff of the University of Wisconsin, where he joined Professor Meiklejohn in conducting a course in Greek civilization for freshmen in the original and interesting scheme of the Wisconsin

Experimental College. He is now the Chairman of the Department of Classics in his University; and in this present volume (one of a number which he has published on themes of Greek scholarship, including a work on *The Greek Tradition in Sculpture*) he gives his readers some of the fruits of that study of Greek civilization on which he has long been engaged.

The object of the volume, as he states in his preface, is 'to study the human values which were sought and realized by Greek democracy, the chief problems that it faced, the measure of success and failure that resulted, the validity of the criticism of it by its own greatest thinkers'. In a moving tribute to 'contemporary Greeks, genuinely democratic in spirit, as I have good reason to know', he acknowledges the debt of inspiration which he has owed, in the composition of his book, to the spectacle of heroic resistance in Greece against aggression in the winter of 1940-1. There is a controlled enthusiasm and a wide sweep in his study of that classical tradition of democracy to which, as he justly says, the Greeks of our own age still remain true. His book is divided into three main parts. The first, called 'Pioneers', is a summary study, compressed into some forty pages, of the growth of the idea and practice of democracy down to the end of the Persian Wars. The second part, which is nearly one-half of the whole, is entitled 'Athens', and contains a general account of the flowering of Athenian democracy, not only on its political side but also in its 'community art', its system of education, its drama, and its general culture. The third part, which runs to some eighty pages, is entitled, 'the criticism and decline of democracy': it is mainly concerned with the Athens of the fourth century, and with the theory of Plato and Aristotle, but it also includes a study of Greek federation (under the title of 'Union Then'), and a brief account of the mixed individualism and cosmopolitanism of the last stage of Greek development.

Spread over a large area of time, and

including a variety of themes (philosophy and literature, sculpture and architecture, as well as history and politics), the book is necessarily summary. But it has grace as well as brevity, and accuracy as well as both. The author presents his readers with a sketch of the general morphology—or (if that word may be permitted) of the general 'sociology'—of the Greek democratic tradition. There is an engaging and attractive breadth in the survey; and the author succeeds in relating poetry, sculpture, and philosophy to the movement of democracy. Perhaps this relation is sometimes overstrained. Drama, after all, is art rather than politics; and when the author says of Euripides that 'he grew heart-sick over the factional wrangling in Athens', he enunciates a dubious proposition. Sculpture, again, goes its own way of beauty, under the impulse of individual artists and schools of art; and its development can hardly be explained as a reflection and mirror of political development. Similarly philosophy 'voyages through strange seas of thought, alone'; and to yoke it to social environment and to sociological causes, as the author does in the first part of his work, is to do imperfect justice to philosophy 'in itself'. Greek civilization is indeed a whole; but each of its parts has its own life.

There are few errors in the book which even a censorious reviewer could note. But it is hardly correct to say (p. 117) that 'all citizens were required to send their boys to elementary private schools' (see K. J. Freeman, *Schools of Hellas*, pp. 57-62.) And did Parmenides really 'write the code of law for his own city in order to stabilize its life'? Diogenes Laertius only reports that he is *said* to have enacted some laws for his fellow-citizens. The translations with which Professor Agard illustrates his text are apposite and just. Is it hypercritical to suggest that references might have been given in all cases (especially, perhaps, to the many quotations from the dramatists), and not only to the chief passages? One or two slips may be noted. Plato did not

say that 'the uncritical life is not worth living'; he spoke of 'the uncriticized life', which is something different (p. 123). Solon did not say that he had 'given the common people sufficient power to assure them of dignity'; he said that he had given the Demos such prerogatives as were sufficient (p. 43).

One last note. The author devotes his last chapter largely to Epictetus. Might it not have been more relevant to his theme to give some account of the work of Alexander the Great, and

especially of his work in founding cities in Western Asia? It is in these cities, subject as they were, that the last flowering of Greek democracy is to be noted. Something of a genius for municipal self-government, which lasted into the Christian era, was the permanent legacy of 'what democracy meant to the Greeks'—a legacy which lasted, on the north coast of the Black Sea, into our Middle Ages.

ERNEST BARKER.

Cambridge.

TEACHERS' PAY

Clarence A. FORBES: *Teachers' Pay in Ancient Greece*. (University of Nebraska Studies in the Humanities, No. 2.) Pp. 60. Lincoln, Nebraska: The University, 1942. Paper.

THIS was a good subject to choose for a monograph, and the author has treated it with a literary skill that will certainly preserve him from the fate he deprecates, that of becoming a new Phrynichus and being condemned by the teachers of to-day 'for reminding them of their troubles'.

I cannot say whether the collection of material is complete, but it is certainly copious. Unfortunately much of the evidence is untrustworthy, and although there are hints that the author recognizes this, he is perhaps too unwilling to spoil his story by scepticism. To take one example, in the *Hippias Major* the sophist is made to say that he never earned so much as an obol at Sparta: later he declares that the Spartans were devoted to lectures on genealogy and that he had accordingly spent much time on working up that subject. Either this is evidence, neglected by Forbes, for the generous giving of free lectures, or one may prefer to believe that the author of the dialogue invented his facts to suit his immediate argument.

More trustworthy evidence is sometimes misrepresented. The fact that Isocrates wrote a speech 'for Nicocles' is no indication that he was a 'ghost-writer'. Epicurus frag. 41 (Bailey) does not show that 'each student in the

Garden had to pay an annual contribution of 120 drachmas', but that this was the sum fixed for each of two particular persons; fees probably varied with circumstances. The point at issue between certain Stoics is missed on p. 26: it was not the absolute propriety of pay for philosophical instruction, but whether one should take fees from all and sundry or only from serious students. If the conditions of Attalus' endowment at Delphi had been accurately stated, it would have been seen that it is possible to deduce the salaries of the teachers then established.

This little essay suggests many reflections on social history, and at times one wishes that the author had given us more background. How is a sophist to be distinguished from a rhetor? What did *grammatici* teach? Why do benefactors of the second century B.C. expect such differing rates of interest? Difficult questions these, perhaps; but an easier problem would be to compare the rates of pay prevailing in other occupations and to relate them to the cost of living. All we get here is the irrelevant observation that the teachers of Miletus in the second century B.C. received 'little more than common sailors in the Athenian fleet *during the fifth century* were sometimes paid' (my italics). Perhaps the author will some day build some speculations on the facts he has here usefully and gracefully assembled.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

CISALPINE GAUL

G. E. F. CHILVER: *Cisalpine Gaul*. Social and economic history from 49 B.C. to the death of Trajan. Pp. viii+236; 2 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941. Cloth, 17s. 6d. net.

In this volume Mr. Chilver discusses the social, cultural, and economic history of the northernmost regions of Italy between the years 49 B.C. and A.D. 117. The method he has adopted is that of surveying the country and its population from various viewpoints: successive chapters deal with geography, the Augustan settlement of Cisalpine Gaul, communications, the distribution and composition of the population, the upper classes, military service, agriculture, industry, religion, and so on. The work has been fully and carefully done, two serviceable maps are included, and the whole book is beautifully produced. What follow are not so much critical comments, for I have few to offer on the book, but rather some questions and reflections borne in upon me during the reading of it. Two general impressions may, however, be recorded here. The first is that the book is somewhat on the full side, and would have gained from compression: if the author could have transferred some of the detailed argumentation and spadework into articles in periodicals or into excursuses at the end, I fancy that the book as a whole would have gained, and the reader would have obtained a better general view. The second is a regret that Mr. Chilver should have limited his survey by closing it at 117. Beyond that date, it may be admitted, the evidence is not abundant and would have to be used with care: but it would be instructive to have a final chapter or epilogue carrying the survey up to the age of the Severi at least, and to see an estimate (for example) of what difference the growing importance of the Danubian frontier made to the commerce, communications, and cities of the eastern Cisalpine region.

Still, Mr. Chilver has a right to choose the limits of his survey, and within the

limits he has covered the ground with great thoroughness. He has some good remarks about the Alpine routes and the use of the passes (p. 5), showing that the Romans had acquired by now a roughly correct notion of the lie of the Alps; interesting too are his comments on Aosta, and the failure of that Augustan settlement to oppose any effective barrier to Caecina's southward march in 69. Some more might perhaps be said as to the suitability of Ravenna for a naval base: on the recruitment and personnel of the fleet Mr. Chilver's figures bear out Tacitus' statement (*Hist.* iii. 12) 'magna pars Dalmatae Pannonique erant', and some confirmatory calculations by Mr. R. Vulpe in *Ephemeris Dacoromana*, iii, 1925 (especially pp. 187-8) might be cited. It has been alleged that before 1914 the Italian mercantile marine was manned in large part by natives of the Dalmatian coast; it looks as though imperial Rome drew on the same skilful and hardy seamen. That Strabo should not mention such notable towns as Aosta, Ateste, and Bergomum is very curious (p. 54), and that omission suggests that the 'revision' of his *Geography* was less thoroughgoing than has been conjectured by some scholars. That Tacitus should apparently pass lightly over Ateste counts for little: in the passage quoted (*Hist.* ii. 6) he is considering the strategic, and not the commercial, importance of Ateste and Patavium.

Mention of Patavium recalls two of its most famous citizens, Livy and Thræsea Paetus. To Livy and to his alleged *Patavinitas* Mr. Chilver devotes some interesting pages (216-21): it may be suggested that possibly Quintilian himself, and certainly later scholars, tended to take Asinius Pollio's epigrams a little too seriously. Asinius Pollio was the sort of man who enjoyed saying that sort of thing about distinguished figures of the age, and a dinner-party *chez* Pollio probably left few reputations unscathed. In these pages Mr. Chilver lumps together Livy and Thræsea

Paetus as 'reactionaries', which seems to me unfair to both men. In previous generations a good deal of ink was spilt with the object of proving that wherever Tacitus passed a judgement—as he does on Thræsea, 'virtutem ipsam' (*Ann.* xvi. 21)—he was usually wrong and always biased. Such an attitude belongs to those days when scholars were determined to view the early principate through rose-tinted glasses: in such a landscape Thræsea Paetus and his like could only be regarded as soured puritans, unfortunate exceptions, who were unwilling to co-operate with 'the spirit of the age'. Scholars such as Rostovtzeff and Momigliano have opened the way for a juster and more sympathetic appraisal of Thræsea's position and policy: for an example I would cite pp. 128 ff. in Mr. D. R. Dudley's *History of Cynicism*.

No one will be misled by slight mis-

prints in footnote 7 on p. 58 or on p. 166, but it is not 'bottles' but 'casks' of wine that Strabo says were as big as houses (v. 1, 12). There may be one or two errors or misprints, but I have not observed them. The impression that remains on a reader is that of a thorough and elaborate piece of work very competently carried out. The whole area has been surveyed thoroughly and judiciously; on the agricultural wealth and importance of the region, on the *liberti*, on the organization of different elements of the population in loyalty to the *princeps* it is admirable. We need more of such regional surveys if the scholar of the future is to get a full and correct view of the Empire, and I hope that when peaceful times come Mr. Chilver will be able to continue with such work.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

THE ROMAN ART OF WAR

F. E. ADCOCK: *The Roman Art of War under the Republic*. Pp. 124. (Martin Classical Lectures, Vol. VIII.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1940. Cloth, 11s. 6d. net.

THIS is a very good little book, and it seems better each time one reads it, so firmly has the author concentrated on what was essential in the Roman art of war. It is surprising that books on the Greek and Roman art of war are so rare in English. English scholars have written much about the reconstruction of ancient campaigns and battles, but much of this work is marred by neglect of the background of ancient warfare. Professor Adcock recognizes that to understand ancient campaigns one must understand the attitude to war of ancient peoples, their discipline and military training, their lack of trained staffs. He makes many references to more modern campaigns and quotes Clausewitz, Jomini, and other military writers. But he never makes the mistake of writing of Roman generals and governments as though they had studied these campaigns and writers. It is very much to be hoped

that this book marks the beginning of a new and saner treatment of ancient warfare in this country; that Professor Adcock may expand it into a fuller treatment of the art of war throughout Roman history; and that his example may inspire someone to undertake the more difficult, but even more necessary, task of writing about the underlying conditions of Greek warfare.

The book is volume viii of the Martin Classical Lectures and consists of five lectures delivered at Oberlin College in May 1939. The lectures discuss in succession the men, the sea, the land, foreign policy and general strategy, generalship. Professor Adcock must have omitted much that he would have liked to include under these wide headings, and it is hardly fair to mention omissions. Perhaps in the first lecture he might have said even more about the nature of Roman discipline, its root in family life, and its prominence in Roman legend and tradition. It is the fundamental explanation of Rome's part in history as well as of the differences between Roman and Greek warfare. To make room for this he might have omitted the full discussion of the

intriguing but obscure problem of the Roman order of battle in the middle Republic. Would it not have sufficed to say about this that the discipline and quality of her men and the reliability of her subordinate commanders enabled Rome to develop a new method of fighting in which the individual soldier could be relied on to fight as an individual and the small unit to fight as a small unit both in attack and defence, and that the Romans thus acquired a tactical adaptability hitherto unknown?

The second lecture, on the sea, is wholly admirable. 'The naval policy of the Romans was to avoid the need of having one' is the gist of it. Since these lectures were delivered sea power in the Mediterranean has acquired a new interest. Professor Adcock shows how owing to the limited efficiency of ships in Roman times sea power could often be controlled from the land. To-day, when the independent action of ships is again restricted, we are again seeing this control of sea power in the Mediterranean from the land. The lecture on the land is an able summary of the geographical conditions determining Roman land warfare in Italy and in the other lands in which Roman armies fought. In the fourth lecture perhaps

not quite enough is said about the effect on strategy of internal Roman politics: the intervention of the People in military policy seems to deserve rather more than the one brief reference, on p. 93. The lecture on generalship supports the military genius of Caesar, while doubting that of Scipio Africanus. Sulla receives the praise as a general that he deserves but does not always get.

The first lecture begins with a half-apology for selecting the subject of war. It is now strange to think that that was necessary in May 1939. Will it become necessary again? In the twenties and thirties audiences were not alone in encouraging this dangerous neglect of an all-important subject. Not a few historians deluded themselves into thinking that war could be avoided by decrying the importance of wars and battles and ignoring the importance of the military qualities of different peoples. Yet what history of any kind would Rome have had if the character of her people had not given her genius for the art of war? And, judged by the standards of our own time, what humane use she usually made of that genius!

N. WHATLEY.

Oxford.

SHORT REVIEWS

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. United States of America. Fogg Museum and Gallatin Collections. By George H. CHASE and Mary Zelia PEASE. Pp. 116; 64 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth and boards, 30s. net.

THIS fascicule of the *Corpus Vasorum* contains the vases of the Fogg Museum at Harvard and the most recently purchased vases of the Gallatin Collection, which has now in the main passed to the Metropolitan Museum in New York. The pictures are useful, but the absence of background makes them unpleasing to the eye, and the lack of pictures of details diminishes the value of this publication to the student. The text of the Fogg section is adequate; the text of the Gallatin section is admirable with its full quotation of parallels and excellent bibliography. A few notes on individual vases follow. Pl. iv. 8: why is the dancer called 'nude'? He seems to be wearing a chiton. Pl. vii. 1 looks provincial or even Etruscan rather than Attic, but it is hard to tell from the photo-

graph. Pl. ix. 2 appears to me to be a near relation of a hydria in Bonn published by Greifenhagen. Pl. xvii. 5 is an interesting puzzle-piece which needs further explanation. Pl. xxii. 1: a very good white lekythos, but why no attribution? Pl. xxix. 9, 10, 11: dated early sixth century, but 9 and 10 can hardly be before 530 B.C. Pl. xxxvi. 3: analogies for the rosettes with pendants are quoted in *Manchester Memoirs*, lxxxiii. 203. Pl. xxxvi. 13: not a woman's head but a mask. Pl. 36. 1: a very good vase by the Swinger, probably about 540 B.C. Pl. 44. 1: a puzzling and interesting piece admirably illustrated and described. Pl. 60. 1: a painted lion with a plastic head; it would be interesting to know what other instances of this hybrid technique have survived—the outside of a red-figure cup of about 460 B.C. in Manchester has a painted symposium for which the stem of the cup forms a plastic table.—This is a good fascicule with good vases.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

Katharine SHEPARD: *The Fish-tailed Monster in Greek and Etruscan Art*. Pp. xii + 125; 16 plates. Privately printed, New York, 1940.

THIS is a careful account of the various forms of fabulous marine life, excluding purely human types, that appear in Greek and Etruscan art. It also contains an excursus on the youthful dolphin-rider, as being closely related to the type of a deity riding a sea monster, and an appendix with lists of examples of certain types—rather arbitrarily selected, or at least the principle is not clear to me.

The first chapter deals with Oriental creatures from which those that begin to appear in Greek art of the seventh century B.C. may be supposed to derive. As so often, while it is possible to point to Oriental examples which look like prototypes for many Greek monsters, it is hard to trace the actual process of derivation; an Assyrian merman, for instance, is common enough, but his iconography is quite different from that of any Greek example. In the succeeding chapters we are given a documented account of the first appearance of each type in Greece and Etruria, its waxing or waning popularity in succeeding ages, and the variations that its iconography undergoes. The nature of the subject does not lead to any startling conclusions, but it is useful to have material of this kind collected and arranged, and the work seems to have been carefully done. In the discussion of the origin and significance of the hippocamp, however (pp. 25 ff.)—a creature not so far identified in Oriental art—it is surely pertinent to recall the association of horses with water in general (compare the Scottish kelpie) and with the sea and Poseidon in particular. The discussion of the youthful dolphin-rider gives more scope for original argument, and the conclusions are interesting. An early example which might perhaps have been mentioned is the archaic plastic vase in the Villa Giulia, in the form of a winged figure riding a dolphin, published by Maximova, *Les Vases plastiques*. The head is missing, so one cannot be certain that it was a youth.

Two points of detail. P. 12: 'a black-figured vase by the painter, Kolchos'; the signature on this jug is that of potter, not painter, and the form of the name is doubtful—see Rumpf, *Sakonides*, p. 25, no. 44, and photographs, plates 29–31. Pp. 16 ff.: any discussion of the Praesos plate ought to mention the white object at the bottom, which, poorly as it compares with the drawing of the hero, is most probably a human foot—Andromeda?

The small illustrations serve the purpose of reference well enough and are nicely printed, though a few are impossibly dark and too many are silhouetted. I should like to see better photographs of the painted marble vase in Baltimore, if indeed any photograph would be enough, before subscribing to the author's repeated opinion that it must be genuine. MARTIN ROBERTSON.

Warming Both Hands. The Autobiography of Henry Rushton FAIRCLOUGH. Pp. xvi + 629; illustrations. Stanford University, Cal.: University Press (London: Milford). Cloth, 22s. 6d. net. H. R. FAIRCLOUGH, who died four years ago at the

age of seventy-six, was best known to English readers for his Loeb Virgil. He was Canadian-born and a graduate of Toronto, but most of his working life was spent in the United States; he went to Stanford in 1893, a few years after its foundation, and remained on its staff until his retirement. His long incumbency was punctuated by spells of lecturing in other universities and by two periods of residence in Europe, where he spent one year as Acting Director of the American School at Rome and three as a Red Cross Commissioner in Switzerland and the Balkans.

The record of this varied experience is, unfortunately, too uncritical to be really interesting, and far too long. The author never succeeds in making the significant stand out from the unimportant, and much of the book consists of trivial incidents, baldly narrated, or lists of people set down without any attempt at appreciation. The writing is stiff and heavy and unenlivened by individuality, and throughout there runs a curious *naïveté* which minutely records courteous commonplaces, his own or other people's, and registers compliments with embarrassing fidelity. But though these reminiscences are not what one might have hoped for, there are interesting things to be found—an account, for example, of the Canadian classical teaching of the writer's youth, and some reflections on the American University system which make one wish that he had let himself give the general and critical estimate which his experience entitled him to make. Of his own classical studies he says something, but not very much; only on the *Appendix Vergiliana* does he write at any length. He restates his view that none of the poems is authentic; that conclusion may be true, though it leaves awkward facts to be explained, but the grounds on which it is based seem far from sound. Vocabulary is his 'simple criterion'; by the tests which he applies, if Milton's *juvenilia* had come down to us with the same precarious status, *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*, not to speak of *Lycidas*, would be refused admission to the canon. But, though he denies him the Appendix, he does his favourite author one good turn; he not only knows but says that Virgil's name in English is Virgil. C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

The Oration of Demosthenes on the Crown with an English Translation and Notes by Francis P. SIMPSON [published in 1882 and here reprinted] and a Rhetorical Commentary by Francis P. DONNELLY, S.J. Pp. x + 356. New York: Fordham University Press, 1941. Cloth, \$2.25.

WHAT is new in this book is Donnelly's commentary (pp. 236–56), which is 'rhetorical in nature and has in view the *schola rhetorica* of the Jesuit *Ratio Studiorum*' (Introduction). It is intended to accompany a course in the art of rhetoric. The history, legal procedures, and national issues are not dealt with, as they have been treated at length in many editions. The commentary 'gives definite and detailed teaching in the argumentation, the logical development of the speech, and on the particular features which have made the

style of Demosthenes the exemplar of forceful speech'.

The commentary analyses the speech in terms of rhetorical forms (Exordium, Proposition and Division, Confirmation and Peroration), and there are subdivisions of the Confirmation into outside and inside the Indictment, Defence Indirect (public and private life), and Direct (positively and negatively).

Within these main structures the sections are analysed for the presence of rhetorical features, e.g. anaphora, litotes, paronomasia, and so forth, and of logical structures such as syllogism. The learner is asked questions, e.g. What is the weakest point in this chain of sorites? (§ 149) and given exercises, e.g. Persuade an audience that an individual, a school, an institution, a city, or a state has followed a glorious policy (p. 265).

To use the book as it is intended to be used the reader must consult the author's *Persuasive Speech*, which is referred to so often that a special index of references is added.

The commentary contains observations that fall as much within the purview of scholarship as of pure rhetoric, e.g. mention of *hapax legomena* and

the number of times certain words occur in Demosthenes. If such points deserved notice here, it would have been advantageous to give them in an index. Some of this matter is elementary, e.g. p. 287, *σκοπῶ* pres. and imperf.; *σκέπτομαι* for other tenses.

The commentary shows signs of haste in the presence of redundancies, e.g. one or other of the observations under § 71, p. 264 that verbs in *-ίζω* are easy of formation and that in English the suffixes *-ize* and *-ism* still live is repeated on pp. 279, 294, 309, and (twice) 327.

No doubt *Persuasive Speech* contains examples in great modern orators of the uses of rhetoric commented upon in this edition of the *De Corona*. It might have been worth putting in at least one example of each kind from a great English-speaking orator. Perhaps space forbade this, but some space at any rate could have been saved for such a purpose by avoiding commenting so often on the occurrence of the same figure.

There are very many misprints in accents and breathings throughout the commentary.

H. BOX.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

HERMATHENA

XLIX: MAY, 1942

F. L. Godfrey, *Plato's Doctrine of Participation*: argues that the solution of the riddle of Plato's *Parmenides* may be found by the hypothesis of objective idealism, for which both thought and things participate in Ideas. W. Beare, *The Life of Terence*: maintains that the Terentian biographical tradition is valueless. E. A. Thompson, *Ammianus' Historical Method*: seeks to show that there is no evidence for the view that the historian used the works of his predecessors to any large extent; on the contrary he relied mainly on oral sources. M. N. Tod, *Lexicographical Notes*. L. J. D. Richardson argues that Hor. *Od.* i. 38. 5-6, *simplici myrto nihil adlabores sedulus curo* = (in effect) 'I am no fuss-pot (*sedulus*) and don't want you (*curo*) to add any extra (*ad-*) elaboration to the plain myrtle'.

L: NOVEMBER, 1942

M. N. Tod, *Lexicographical Notes* (contd.). R. C. P. Hunson discusses the meaning of *δίκαιος* in Luke, 23. 47, and argues against the recent view that *δ.* = 'innocent' and that Luke is here adapting the Marcan Passion-narrative to his own purpose. L. J. D. Richardson (1) suggests that the word *remora* (name of a fish in Pliny, *N.H.* xxxii. 6) is formed by haplology from *remimora*; (2) gives an account of an unpublished edition of Horace's *Odes* by Arthur Palmer, the final page-proof of which is in his possession.

HARVARD STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

LIII: 1942

A. S. Pease, *Some Aspects of Invisibility*: on

instances of praeternatural appearances and disappearances drawn from heterogeneous sources. H. Kuhn, *The True Tragedy, II*: continuing his article on the relationship between Greek tragedy and Plato, argues that on certain problems—suffering, evil, individual freedom—P. represents the next stage after tragedy in a progressive clarification of thought. S. Dow, *Corinthiacs*: re-edits *Cor.* viii. 1, no. 11 (Meritt), and interprets it as a list of fallen; annotates various inscriptions of the Greek period; and seeks, chiefly in oligarchy and mercantilism, for an explanation of the paucity of inscriptions before 146 B.C. S. Wilcox, *The Scope of Early Rhetorical Instruction*: adduces evidence for his view that in the age of the Sophists and Plato the primary interest of pupil and teacher was deliberative, and not (as commonly stated) forensic, oratory. A. H. Travis, *Donatus and the Scholia Danielis*: a stylistic comparison: comparison of the *scholia Danielis* with Donatus' commentary on Terence shows that the *scholia Danielis*, though possibly reproducing the substance of what Donatus wrote about Virgil, diverget 00 far from Donatus' style of comment to be regarded as his *ipsissima verba*. Summaries of dissertations.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XXXVIII. 1: JANUARY, 1943

R. J. Bonner and Gertrude Smith, *Administration of Justice in the Delphic Amphictyony*: reviews the evidence for the jurisdiction of the League and its procedure. H. H. Dubs, *A Roman Influence for Chinese Painting*: explains resemblances between the paintings exhibited by Chen Tang after his expedition against the Huns in 36 B.C. and those associated with a Roman

triumph by supposing that he had attached to himself a body of Crassus' troops who had escaped from the Parthians; the name Li-jien for a Chinese city suggests that these Romans were settled there. Sterling Dow, *Studies in the Athenian Tribute Lists, II*: examines schemes proposed for the disposition of the lists of 454-439 B.C. on the first stele. Murray Fowler, *The Myth of 'Epicθévos*: cites a Vedic parallel and explains the legend as a creation-myth, symbolic of man's divine origin and dual nature. N. T. Pratt, *The Euripidean Medea*, 38-43: defends *Med.* 40-1 as dramatically significant and their repetition at 379-80 as a deliberate piece of technique. Robert Schlaifer, *Demon of Paeania, Priest of Asclepius*: discusses the interpretation of *I.G.* ii.2 4969, identifying Demon with the cousin of Demosthenes, and its implications. L. A. Mackay, *On 'Patavinity'*: takes Pollio's remark as a mere epigram aimed at Livy's *ubertas* and alluding to the woollen stuffs manufactured at Patavium. C. A. Forbes adds *πατέφρητος* to L. and S.⁹ and explains it as = *ἐξέφρητος*. B. L. Charney, *Ellipsis of the Verb in Seneca's Epistulae Morales*: notes passages where edd. have inserted a verb unnecessarily. J. D. Jefferis, *The Concept of Fortuna in Cornelius Nepos*: instances of personification of *fortuna* are few and colourless.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

LXIII. 4: OCTOBER, 1942

L. R. Taylor, *Caesar's Colleagues in the Pontifical College*: working from the lists in Macrobius (iii. 13. 12) and Cicero (*De Har. Resp.* 12), examines the personnel of the College between 74 and 57 B.C., and considers Caesar's treatment of it

during his dictatorship. K. Pritchett, *The Tribe Ptolemais*: dates the creation of this tribe at the end of 224/3, and offers evidence for the Demes included in it. L. H. Gray, *Possible Trochaic Dimeters in Non-Latin Italic and in Gaulish Inscriptions*: despite various distorting influences finds traces of metre and strophic arrangement in such inscriptions as the Iguvine Tablets and the Curse of Vibia. A. H. Krappe, *The Sovereignty of Erin*: adduces parallels from Greece, Persia, and India to show that neither the magic fawn nor the mysterious woman, as symbol of royal power, is a specifically Celtic conception, but both belong to primitive Indo-European mythology. O. Neugebauer, *On Two Astronomical Passages in Plutarch's De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo*: on *Moralia* vi, p. 202, 14 (= 1028 F) maintains (a) that *Χαλδαῖοι δὲ λέγουσι τὸ ἔαρ . . . ἐν τῷ διὰ πασῶν*, means that the relative lengths of the seasons can be found by adding the harmonic numbers to 83, and (b) that, when its errors are corrected, *τοῦ δὲ ἡλίου . . . ἄχρι τῆς ἱσημερίας* states a familiar method of reckoning the increase in daylight from winter solstice to equinox. G. Norwood, *Two Notes on Pindar, Isthmians i and vii*: in i. 67 f. takes *ἄλλοισι* with *γελᾷ* (laughs at), and understands *πλοῦτῳ* with *ἐμπύπτῳ* (incubans): in vii. 31 ff. reads *ἀντιφερέζων* for *Ἀμφύραον*. G. Highet, *The Shipwrecked Slaver*: finds in *Rudens* 510-11 a parody of some tragic treatment of the *cena* of Tereus or Thyestes, and its physical effect upon the victim. H. Fränkel, *Correction of the Note on Menander's Epitrepontes* (lxii, pp. 355 f.): admits the objection to punctuating as previously suggested (with *πρὸς θεῶν* at the end instead of the beginning of a sentence), but maintains that the rest of the argument is not affected.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts and extracts from periodicals are not included in this list unless they are also published separately.

- Balogh (E.) *Political Refugees in Ancient Greece from the Period of the Tyrants to Alexander the Great*. Pp. xvi+134. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1943. Stiff paper, 7s. 6d. net.
- Boyd (J.) *Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris. An Interpretation and Critical Analysis*. Pp. 176. Oxford: Blackwell, 1942. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Cary (E.) *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. With an English Translation. Vol. IV: Books VI. 49-VII. (Loeb Classical Library.)* Pp. 385. London: Heinemann, 1943. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Dohan (E. H.) *Italic Tomb-Groups in the University Museum*. Pp. xii+113; 56 plates, 69 figures. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 45s. 6d. net.
- Durham University Journal, Vol. XXXV (New Series, Vol. IV), No. 2. March 1943.
- Ehrenberg (V.) *The People of Aristophanes. A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy*. Pp. xii+320;

- 19 plates. Oxford: Blackwell, 1943. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Fraenkel (E.) *Aeschylus: New Texts and Old Problems. (From Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXVIII.)* Pp. 24. London: Milford, 1943. Paper, 2s. net.
- Glover (T. R.) *Cambridge Retrospect*. Pp. xii+145. Cambridge: University Press, 1943. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Haight (E. H.) *Essays on the Greek Romances*. Pp. ix+208. New York: Longmans, 1943. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Haskell (H. J.) *This was Cicero: Modern Politics in a Roman Toga*. Pp. viii+406+xiii; 13 plates. London: Secker & Warburg. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Hennes (W. R.) and Arnold (R. E.) *Iris. A Reading List of Articles Selected From Classical Periodicals*. Saint Louis: University Book Store, 1942. Cloth, \$1.95.
- Hesperia. Journal of the American School of

- Classical Studies at Athens. Volume XII, No. 1. January-March, 1943. The American Excavations in the Athenian Agora: Twenty-third Report. Pp. 96. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1943. Paper, \$1.75.
- Howe (L. L.) The Pretorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian (A.D. 180-305). Pp. xiii+141. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1942. Cloth, 12s. net.
- Johnston (G.) The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. Pp. xv+153. Cambridge: University Press, 1943. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Kapp (E.) Greek Foundations of Traditional Logic. (Columbia Studies in Philosophy, No. 5.) Pp. viii+95. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Little (A. M. G.) Myth and Society in Attic Drama. Pp. vii+95. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Löfstedt (E.) Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins. Erster Teil: Ueber einige Grundfragen der lateinischen Nominalsyntax. Zweite, erweiterte Auflage. Pp. xxv+407. (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, X: 1.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1942. Paper.
- McGeachy (J. A.) Quintus Aurelius Symmachus and the Senatorial Aristocracy of the West. Pp. v+203. Private Edition, Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, 1942. Paper.
- Marcus (R.) Josephus. With an English Translation. Vol. VII: Jewish Antiquities, Books XII-XIV. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. viii+788. London: Heinemann, 1943. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Medievalia et Humanistica. Fasciculus I. Pp. 142. Boulder, Colorado: Summit Press, 1943. Paper, \$1.50.
- Moore (F. G.) Livy. With an English Translation. Vol. VII: Books XXVI-XXVII. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. x+424; 8 maps. London: Heinemann, 1943. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Morey (C. R.) Early Christian Art. An Outline of the Evolution of Style and Iconography in Sculpture and Painting from Antiquity to the Eighth Century. Pp. 282+69 pages of plates. Princeton: University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Plato Arabus. Volumen II. Alfarabius de Platonis Philosophia. Ediderunt F. Rosenthal et R. Wagner. (Corpus Platonicum Medii Aevi.) Pp. xxii+30+22. London: Warburg Institute, 1943. Cloth, 15s.
- Prentice (W. K.) Those Ancient Dramas Called Tragedies. Pp. 194; 2 plates. Princeton: Princeton University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 16s. 6d. net.
- Pritchett (W. K.) The Five Attic Tribes after Kleisthenes. (Johns Hopkins dissertation.) Pp. 39. Baltimore: privately printed, 1943. Paper.
- Richter (G. M. A.) Kouros. A Study of the Development of the Greek Kouros from the late seventh to the early fifth century B.C. By G. M. A. R. with the co-operation of Irma A. Richter. Pp. xxi+428; 208 photographs. New York: Oxford University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 84s. net.
- Sedgefield (W. B.) Locorum nonnullorum in Epistulis M. T. Ciceronis mendose descriptorum emendationes. Editio secunda. Pp. 15. Privately printed, London, 1942. Paper.
- Sheppard (J. T.) Aeschylus, the Prophet of Greek Freedom. An Essay on the Oresteian Trilogy. Pp. iv+64. (Vol. IV of the Interpreter Series.) London: Thomas Murby & Co. (George Allen & Unwin), 1943. Paper, 2s. net.
- Tate (Sir R. W.) Carmina Dublinensia. Pp. xix+117. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co. (London: Longmans), 1943. Cloth.
- Trouard (M. A.) Cicero's Attitude towards the Greeks. (Chicago dissertation.) Chicago: privately printed, 1942.
- Turyn (A.) The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus. Pp. v+141. New York: Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America (to be obtained from Herald Square Press, Inc., 233 Spring Street, New York), 1943. Cloth, \$3.

ography in
ity to the
of plates.
: Milford),

le Platonis
hal et R.
dii Aevi.)
Institute,

nas Called
Princeton:
: Milford),

ribes after
tion.) Pp.
3. Paper.
dy of the
m the late
B.C. By
of Irma A.
pchs. New
(London:

llorum in
scriptorum
. 15. Pri-

t of Greek
n Trilogy.
ter Series.)
orge Allen

Pp. xix+
(London:

wards the
cago: pri-

on of the
141. New
ciences in
ld Square
ork), 1943.